American Literature

A Journal of Literary History, Criticism, and Bibliography

Volume One | MAY, 1929 | Number Two

CONTENTS

THE SOURCES OF NEW ENGLAND DEMOCRACY: A Controversial Statement in Parrington's *Main Currents In American Thought*

ESTHER E. BURCH
Reed College

I

IN HIS *The Colonial Mind*,[1] Professor Vernon Louis Parrington discusses the Puritans and Pilgrims of early Massachusetts from a rather unusual point of view. Of the two groups of settlers, he says in part:

> The immigrant gentlemen who came to Massachusetts Bay were Puritan Anglicans. . . . It is reasonable to suppose that as strict Calvinists, . . . they came hither with the conscious purpose of setting up the complete Genevan Discipline in the new world.[2] . . . Calvinism was no friend of equalitarianism. It was rooted too deeply in the Old Testament for that, was too rigidly aristocratic.[3] . . . The intellectual leaders of Plymouth . . . were Brownist-Separatists of plebeian origins.[4] . . . Two cardinal principles—which at bottom were one—. . . found their way to New England in the "Mayflower": the principle of a democratic church and a democratic state.[5]. . . The teachings of Luther, erected on the major principle of justification by faith, conducted straight to political liberty, and he refused to compromise or turn away from pursuing the direct path.[6]. . . Clearly, this is the spirit of uncompromising individualism that would eventually espouse the principle of democracy in church and state; and it was their native sympathy with such liberalism that led the radical Separatists to turn more naturally to Luther than to Calvin.[7]

Briefly, Professor Parrington's contention seems to be this: that, among the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay colony, Calvinist theology and political aristocracy went hand in hand, whereas, among the Pilgrims of Plymouth Plantation, Lutheran theology and political democracy were equally inseparable.

This attitude, especially since it is accompanied by the acceptance of the theory that the Puritan aristocrats finally acceded to Separatist

[1] Volume One of *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York, 1927).
[2] V. L. Parrington, *The Colonial Mind* (New York, 1927), p. 16.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

democratic ideals,[8] places an uncommon emphasis upon Lutheranism as a force in the development of colonial Massachusetts. To explain this interpretation, Professor Parrington makes a brief survey of European religious and political movements relevant to Puritanism and Separatism; and, since the value of such a treatment depends upon its validity as history, it seems natural to expect definite references to the investigations of recognized authorities. It may be assumed that Professor Parrington's reading on the subject has been comprehensive, but the works listed in his bibliography do not seem to bear out the theory that the Pilgrims were Lutheran democrats whose influence prevented the Puritans from imprinting upon America a lasting Calvinistic aristocracy.

II

Now, so much of Calvinism is based upon Lutheranism that it may be difficult to conceive of the two systems as having any very different political results. Of the similarity of the views of Luther and Calvin, Preserved Smith says: "There is not one original thought in any of Calvin's works. . . . First and foremost he was dependent on Luther, and to an extent that cannot be exaggerated. Especially from the 'Catechisms,' 'The Bondage of the Will,' and the 'Babylonian Captivity of the Church,' Calvin drew all his principal doctrines even to details."[9] In any case, there are certain differences, due to the circumstances and characters of the two reformers, which are tremendously significant.

That Professor Parrington is taking a rather unusual position with regard to Luther's political influence is further suggested by this excerpt from Preserved Smith's *The Age of the Reformation:*

> The tendency of both Luther and Calvin to exalt the state took two divergent forms according to their understanding of what the state was. Lutheranism became the ally of absolute monarchy, whereas Calvinism had in it a republican element. It is no accident that Germany developed a form of government in which a paternal but bureaucratic care of the people supplied the place of popular liberty, whereas America, on the whole the most Calvinistic of the great states, carried to conclusion the idea of the rule of the majority. The English Reformation was at first Lutheran in this respect, but after 1580 it began to take the strong Calvinistic tendency that led to the Commonwealth.[10]

[8] Parrington, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
[9] Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation* (New York, 1920), pp. 163-164.
[10] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 594.

Nor is Preserved Smith alone in this unequivocal position. R. H. Tawney,[11] R. H. Murray,[12] and J. N. Figgis[13] consider Lutheranism the conservative and Calvinism the radical force. G. P. Gooch, also, takes this attitude, commenting thus: "And as we trace the development of the theory and practice of resistance through the next century, we shall convince ourselves that despite his guarded reservations, the teaching of Calvin, even though we do not care to describe it with Mignet as the 'religion of insurrection,' made steadily for popular right."[14]

Since they were primarily religious reformers, neither Luther nor Calvin developed a wholly consistent political theory,[15] but, of the two, certainly Calvin produced the more coherent system.[16] Not only had he been trained as a jurist, but he had been called upon to supervise the government of Geneva. Such experience was denied Luther, and, as the first of the reformers to break with the church, he was forced to seek protection wherever it was to be found. He recognized in the church a powerful enemy, which could be opposed successfully only through the exaltation of the secular authority.[17] He had found in the domination of the state by the church a source of the corruption of man's spiritual life. Hoping to effect a complete reformation by championing the temporal power, Luther brought about the elevation of the state at the expense of the church.[18]

If Luther had ever seriously contemplated approaching the emperor for aid against the church, the accession in 1519 of the Spaniard, Charles V, forced him to look elsewhere.[19] The publication in 1520 of the three tracts, "An Address to the Nobility of the German Nation," "On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church of God," and "On the Liberty of a Christian Man," indicates that he had decided to rely upon the "godly" princes.[20] Seeking to justify the princes'

[11] R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, 1926), p. 102.

[12] R. H. Murray, *The Political Consequences of the Reformation* (Boston, 1926), pp. 65, 103.

[13] J. N. Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius* (Cambridge, 1916), p. 86.

[14] G. P. Gooch and H. J. Laski, *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 7.

[15] Gooch, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 88; Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

[16] Murray, *op. cit.*, p. 90; Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[17] Murray, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 76; Figgis, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[18] Figgis, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-85.

[19] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 595.

[20] L. H. Waring, *The Political Theories of Martin Luther* (New York, 1910), p. 138. In his bibliography, Professor Parrington indicates that Waring is his chief authority on Martin Luther. For that reason, Waring's summary (*ibid.*, pp. 276-277) is important in that it contains some conclusions which seem hardly warranted by the excerpts he has quoted

encroachment upon the imperial rights and their religious revolt against pope and Catholic emperor, he set about proving the "liberty of the Christian man." Luther's anger at the fact that the excesses of the Peasants' War (1525) were committed in his name suggests that he could hardly have considered political democracy a corollary to the spiritual tenets he had expressed. Concerning this point, Tawney says: "His vindication of the spiritual freedom of common men, and his outspoken abuse of the German princes, had naturally been taken at their face value by serfs groaning under an odious tyranny, and, when the inevitable rising came, the rage of Luther, like that of Burke in another age, was sharpened by embarrassment at what seemed to him a hideous parody of truths which were both sacred and his own."[21]

However we may choose to interpret those works written by Luther previous to the Peasants' War, there is no mistaking the meaning of those following that rising. The claim of the peasants that the Scriptures authorized democracy called forth this reply from the reformer: "This article would make all men equal and so change the spiritual kingdom of Christ into an external worldly one. Impossible! An earthly kingdom cannot exist without inequality of persons. Some must be free, others serfs, some rulers,

from the reformer's writings. His statement that Luther furthered the cause of political liberty contrasts markedly with opinions and quotations presented earlier in the book (*ibid.*, pp. 103-104, 144, 145, 152-153, 159-160, 244-246, 251). In quoting Geffcken (*ibid.*, p. 256), in fact, Waring recognizes the fact that political liberty "has nothing necessarily in common with democracy." *The Political Theories of Martin Luther* was published, moreover, at a time when it was rather common for political theorists to eulogize the German empire, and Waring stresses Luther's influence upon that political system and upon its doctrine of the sovereignty of the state. By this emphasis, he has made Luther an ally of absolutism rather than of democracy. To confirm the reformer's connection with political liberty, Waring quotes Scherer's statement (*ibid.*, p. 281) that, "The United States, Great Britain and its world-encircling colonies, Holland and its dependencies, the German empire, are to-day what they are largely because of the life of Martin Luther." Whether or not we accept Waring's interpretation, this statement is obviously too indefinite and too sweeping. (*Cf.* Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 597). Smith (*op. cit.*, p. 788) and Murray (*op. cit.*, p. 79) both indicate their familiarity with Waring's work, but, as has been previously demonstrated, do not agree with him that, "It was not in consequence of his [Luther's] teaching but merely in spite of it, that for the next two centuries monarchical government became more autocratic, as feudalism was being transformed into civil government." (Waring, *op. cit.*, p. 236). This statement is rather surprising in view of the fact that, in placing full responsibility upon Luther for the transformation from feudalism into civil government, Waring recognizes the doctrine of the sovereignty of the state (which, until the latter part of the eighteenth century, was linked with monarchical absolutism) as a vital element of the transition. (Waring, *op cit.*, p. 276).

[21] Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

others subjects."[22] Finally, he issued a tract in which he spoke to the princes in these terms: "Let everyone who can, as he is able, cut, stab, choke, and strike the stiff-necked, obdurate, blind, infatuated peasants. . . . Such wonderful times are these that a prince can better merit Heaven with bloodshed than another with prayer."[23] It is a difficult task to reconcile this attitude with Professor Parrington's conception of Luther as one whose "teachings, . . . conducted straight to political liberty," and who "refused to compromise or turn away from pursuing the direct path."[24]

It is true that Luther had no illusions as to the nature of hereditary monarchs. In his "Treatise on Civil Authority," he said: "Since the foundation of the world a wise prince has been a rare bird and a just one much rarer." But he had even less faith in "Herr Omnes": "I would rather suffer a prince doing wrong than a people doing right," he once declared; and again: "It is in no wise proper for anyone who would be a Christian to set himself up against his government, whether it act justly or unjustly."[25]

While we may agree sincerely with Figgis that in the main the principles of Calvin were "in no way based on any ideal of individual liberty,"[26] it is not easy, however, to subscribe to the belief that the connection of his doctrines with democracy was purely accidental, because "Calvin happened to influence permanently either a minority within a hostile state as in France or England, or a nation struggling to be free like the Dutch."[27] If chance played a large part, it was in shaping the course of events which established Calvin as the leader at Geneva, the majority of whose citizens were interested in commerce and industry. Smith,[28] Tawney,[29] and Murray[30] show the effect of this connection on Calvin's doctrines, and the eager acceptance of those doctrines by the classes for whom they were intended. Luther, on the other hand, was unsympathetic with the rising commercial classes. He opposed interest on loans, accepted the medieval conception of the "just price," denounced the trading companies as the greatest misfortunes of Germany, and advocated the total

[22] Martin Luther, "Exhortation to Peace on the Twelve Articles of the Swabian Peasants."
[23] Martin Luther, "Against the Thievish, Murderous Hordes of Peasants."
[24] Parrington, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
[25] Quoted by Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 595.
[26] Figgis, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
[27] Figgis, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
[28] Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 530-531, 608-609.
[29] Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
[30] Murray, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-73.

prohibition of that trading in spices and other foreign wares which took money out of the country. Calvin, although he understood the danger of "unbridled license," asserted that, "If we forbid usury wholly we bind consciences by a bond straiter than that of God himself."[31] To quote Tawney: "No contrast could be more striking than that between his [Luther's] social theory and the outlook of Calvin. Calvin, with all his rigor, accepted the main institutions of a commercial civilization, and supplied a creed to the classes that were to dominate the future. The eyes of Luther were on the past. He saw no room in a Christian society for the middle classes."[32] While this excerpt is, perhaps, too sweeping in its deductions from the reformers' writings, it illustrates very aptly the underlying contrast between the attitudes of the two. The rise of the bourgeoisie cannot, of course, be considered the fulfillment of the ideals of democracy, but, because it served later as a precedent for the recognition of the rights of the lower classes, Calvin, in supplying a creed for that movement, served the democratic cause.

Preserved Smith summarizes the tendency of Calvinism toward democracy thus:

> With the tocsins ringing in his ears, jangling discordantly with the servile doctrines of Paul and Luther, Calvin set to work to forge a theory that should combine liberty with order. Carrying a step further than had his masters the separation of civil and ecclesiastical authority, he yet regarded civil government as the most sacred and honorable of all merely human institutions. The form he preferred was an aristocracy, but, where monarchy prevailed, Calvin was not prepared to recommend its overthrow, save in extreme cases. Grasping at Luther's idea of constitutional, or contractual, limitations on the royal power,[33] he asserted that the king should be resisted, when he violated his rights, not by private men but by elected magistrates to whom the guardianship of the people's rights should be particularly entrusted. The high respect in which Calvin was held, and the clearness and comprehensiveness of his thought made him ultimately the most influential of the Protestant publicists. By his doctrine the Dutch, English, and American nations were educated to popular sovereignty.[34]

[31] Quoted by Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

[32] Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[33] Luther, in groping about for some legal limitation on the power of the Catholic emperor, came across the theories of the Italian, Quirini. He utilized them to exalt the princes' power as well as to limit the emperor's. His application was, consequently, undemocratic. Calvin's culminated in the radical theory of true constitutionalism. (Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 595.)

[34] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 597. *Cf.* Murray, *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 95, 102-106, 117.

It is well to bear in mind, however, the admonition of G. P. Gooch: "Modern Democracy is the child of the Reformation, not the Reformers. Of the latter, inconsistency is the chief characteristic. Not only is the man not the doctrine, but the doctrine itself is found to contain much that its author never could or never cared to find in it."[35] Nor, for that matter, does one group of followers necessarily agree with another. Radical minorities usually advocate liberty, knowing how dangerous it is to the existing order, but, once in power, turn for the maintenance of their own régime to a system of espionage and rigorous punishment. Thus, the Calvinism of the Dutch and the French Huguenots (which produced such extreme political theories as those stated in the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* of Philip du Plessis-Mornay) was a radical force under persecution, whereas that of Geneva and Scotland, though anti-absolutist, was a conservative, persecuting power.[36]

Therefore, though Lutheranism tended generally toward absolutism and Calvinism towards democracy, Calvinism could be either aristocratic or democratic, depending upon the character and circumstances of the believer. Because of the possibility that Lutheranism might under other circumstances have developed a democratic tendency, it is of less consequence to determine exactly, even were this possible, what either Luther or Calvin believed than to discover the source or sources of the religious and political ideas of the Puritans and Pilgrims.

III

There seems to be little doubt that the Pilgrims were, in matters of doctrine, not Lutheran at all, but as thoroughly Calvinistic as the Puritans.[37] R. G. Usher says of the Pilgrims: "They no doubt followed Robinson in his espousal of conservative Calvinism, accepting fully the doctrine of the Elect, of Predestination, and all that they involved. They also championed the right of investigation in the Scriptures for all individuals and soon found that this type of de-

[35] Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[36] Figgis, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[37] Professor Parrington (*op. cit.*, p. 16) says that the Pilgrims were Brownist-Separatists who "consorted ill" with their Puritan neighbors of Massachusetts Bay, "except in matters of doctrine." Whether he means to class Pilgrims and Puritans as Calvinists in doctrine, and to consider the Pilgrims Lutheran only in church government is not clear, since he also says: "It was the doctrines of Separatism, quite as much as the principle of the independency of the congregation, that aroused the fierce antagonism of the Presbyterians equally with Anglicans. In the main those doctrines did not derive from John Calvin; they go back rather to Wittenberg than to Geneva, to the principles of Luther and certain German sects." (*Op. cit.*, p. 9.)

fense for their own secession from the Papacy and the Established Church involved permission to their own members to differ from the Minister and the majority in their reading of the Scripture."[38] Williston Walker, in discussing this question, says: "That Endicott[39] was readily impressed by the expositions of the Plymouth deacon was natural. Puritans and Separatists had never had any doctrinal disagreement; both were pronounced Calvinists."[40] H. K. Rowe is of the same opinion, for he says: "Doctrinally the members [of John Robinson's congregation at Leyden] were Calvinists."[41] Indeed, practically all the Pilgrim writings indicate the truth of these statements. In "The Seven Articles of 1617,"[42] the notes of explanation stated that the Leyden congregation agreed "wholy in all points" with the French Reformed Churches, which are known to have been Calvinist. Perhaps the most conclusive evidence that we have with regard to the Calvinist theology of the Leyden congregation is the record of the debate in which Robinson defended Calvinism against the Arminian, Episcopius.[43] It is also significant that the Pilgrims left Amsterdam for fear of becoming involved in the disputes of the other religious communities established there. They particularly disapproved of Smyth's acceptance of the Mennonite faith.[44] Robinson's famous farewell address shows, however, that they were not rigid in their Calvinism, but considered it well to be ready to accept "whatever truth shall be made known unto you."[45]

This willingness to deviate from the absolute path of Calvin's teachings is noticeable chiefly in the Pilgrims' church government, which had, in addition to Calvinist presbyterian customs, certain congregationalist characteristics.[46] It is necessary, then, to determine the source or sources of these practices. The ideas of Browne, Barrowe, Greenwood, Penry, and others, who have been classed more or less discriminately as Anabaptists, Brownists, or congregational-

[38] R. G. Usher, *The Pilgrims and Their History* (New York, 1918), pp. 43-44.

[39] Endicott, it will be remembered, was the leader of the Salem branch of the Massachusetts Bay colony. During the hardships of the first winter, he and the other settlers were cared for by the Plymouth doctor and deacon.

[40] Williston Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States* (New York, 1894), p. 101.

[41] H. K. Rowe, *The History of Religion in the United States* (New York, 1924) I, p. 22.

[42] Williston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (New York, 1893), p. 91.

[43] Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, p. 60.

[44] Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, p. 83; *Cf.* Usher, *op. cit.* p. 33.

[45] Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[46] Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, pp. 101-102; *Cf.* H. M. Dexter's *Congregationalism* (Boston, 1871), pp. 118-127.

ists, must be considered in their relation to the Pilgrims as well as with regard to a possible connection with Lutheranism.

As Professor Parrington suggests in considering the origins of Separatism, the Anabaptists, Diggers, and other sects, though of German origin, were of rather "ancient lineage."[47] In Zwickau, Waldensian heresy had long been fostered,[48] and the ideas of Huss had persisted in that locality, despite the ever-recurring persecutions to which his followers were subjected.[49] At Erfurt, during Luther's residence there as a student, Hussite propaganda had been prevalent,[50] and it is definitely known that Luther was familiar with the works and ideas of the earlier reformer.[51] Had it not been for the persistence of such heresy, it seems likely that Luther would have met the fate of his predecessor. For protection, the Anabaptists and revolting peasants claimed derivation from the successful heretic, Martin Luther, rather than from their true progenitors, Huss and the Waldensians. The Anabaptists were, moreover, a heterogeneous group with varying shades of opinion,[52] whereas "Lutheranism became an established church, predominantly an aristocratic and middle-class party of vested interest and privilege."[53] Consequently, even could it be proved that the Pilgrims were Anabaptist in their church government, it could not, therefore, be assumed that they were influenced by Luther's ideas. Both the Quakers and Seekers, whom Professor Parrington mentions, in addition to the fact that they, with the Fifth Monarchy Men, Ranters, and others, belonged to a much later movement,[54] seem to have been equally abhorrent to Pilgrims and Puritans alike.[55]

[47] Parrington, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[48] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41, 144.

[50] T. M. Lindsay, "Martin Luther" (essay in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

[51] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 41; G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (London, 1912), p. 353; H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif* (Oxford, 1926), I, p. 9.

[52] Walker (*The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, p. 2) seems to feel that Zwingli is much more likely to have influenced the Anabaptists than any other sixteenth century reformer. Though Smith (*op. cit.*, p. 100) does not consider it true that "the origin and growth of the Anabaptists was due to the German translation of the Bible," he does believe that the German Bible was a powerful influence, in itself, in the growth of many sects.

[53] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[54] This movement arose during the Commonwealth as a protest against the existing order. *Cf.* W. B. Selbie, *Nonconformity: Its Origin and Progress* (New York and London, 1912), p. 97.

[55] Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, p. 118; Usher, *op. cit.*, pp. 356-363. These two works show the attitude toward the Quakers. Although I have encountered no definite material on the Seekers in Massachusetts, Bradford (*History of Plimouth Plantation*, New York, 1908, p. 299) reports the reception of Roger Williams' Seeker doctrines at Plymouth, Salem, and Massachusetts Bay.

The works of John Huss, from which Luther either directly or indirectly drew many of his ideas, were little more than a paraphrase of the writings of John Wyclif.[56] Not only had Wyclif enunciated the two cardinal principles of the Reformation, the priesthood of the believer and the rightful duty of free inquiry, but he had translated or sponsored the translation of the Bible into English.[57] This Wycliffite Bible and Wyclif's "Wicket" are known to have been in use among the common people until about the time of the appearance of the Tyndale Bible.[58] Furthermore, it seems to be the consensus of opinion not only that Lollardry never died out in England, but that it spread also to Scotland and the Netherlands, where it lingered on down to the time of the Reformation.[59] It is also significant that when the works of Luther found their way into England, the clergy were more apprehensive of their effect on the readers of Wyclif's "Wicket" than of the actual growth of Lutheranism. Bishop Tunstall wrote to Erasmus in 1523, "It is no question of pernicious novelty, it is only that new arms are being added to the great band of Wycliffite heretics."[60]

G. M. Trevelyan shows in the following excerpt how dangerous it is to assume that all non-Calvinist Protestantism in the England of the Pilgrims was Lutheran: "In the reign of Henry the Seventh a spirit seemed to be moving on the face of the waters. An ever-increasing number of men burnt for Lollardry was only one of the signs of the times, . . . for the revival of Wycliffism had set on foot a serious movement for reformation in England, before the good news came from Germany."[61] Although the political and religious views of Wyclif and Luther were very similar,[62] Lollardry may have developed, by the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a democratic church government resembling some of the Anabaptist or early congregationalist systems. Of the Lollardry of the fifteenth century, W. B. Selbie says: "They held their meetings in woods, lonely fields and secret places";[63] and of its successors of the sixteenth century: "But the meetings were secret and sporadic, and

[56] Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 353; Workman, *op. cit.*, I, p. 8.
[57] Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 349.
[59] Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, pp. 353-354; Workman, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 8-12; Lewis Sergeant, *John Wyclif* (London, 1892), pp. 337-359.
[60] Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
[61] *Ibid.*, p. 347.
[62] F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *The Social and Political Ideals of Some Great Medieval Thinkers* (New York, 1923), pp. 209-212, 217 (from the essay on Wyclif).
[63] Selbie, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

there was probably no uniformity among them either of ritual or method. . . . Apart from this, it would be very difficult to account for the rapid advance of Protestant and Free Church doctrines in later times. The fact is that, for centuries, the ground had been prepared."[64] Thus, although the records are too meager to establish the fact rather than the possibility, the church government of the Pilgrims and other Separatists may be as logically considered an outgrowth of Lollardry as of Anabaptism."[65]

In consideration of the fact that the Pilgrims were Calvinists in doctrine, it seems more likely that for reasons of circumstance and expediency, they developed their congregationalist church rules directly from the presbyterian teachings of Calvin. As Walker shows, Calvin had worked out, in presbyterianism, a system which had the potentialities of congregationalism:

> His Genevan church thus approximated far more nearly to the New Testament conception than that of the English political reformers or Luther, while it did not fully or exclusively submit itself to the biblical test. Thus Calvin went a long way toward the position of Congregationalism when he held that ministers were to be approved by the congregations whom they were to serve, instead of being appointed by spiritual superiors, sovereigns, or patrons; and when he committed the government of churches not to a clerical order but to elderships, composed of ministers and laymen.[66]

During the reign of the Catholic Queen Mary, there was a Protestant congregation which met in the vicinity of London to worship God in the approved Calvinist manner, probably the earliest Separatist congregation, as such, in England. Many non-Catholics, however, left England to escape persecution. These considered them-

[64] Selbie, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

[65] Walker (*Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 6-7) inclines to the theory that the Separatist church government was largely due to an Anabaptist influence. He stresses particularly the fact that the Dutch immigration of 1562 was confined chiefly to the London and Norwich districts and adds that it was also in these areas that Separatism had its beginning. These districts were, however, the most lastingly affected by Lollardry. (*Cf.* Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 327.) Champlin Burrage, whose contributions are more recent and very thorough-going in this field, says: "Anabaptism had practically no influence in England before 1612." (Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters*, Cambridge, 1912, I, p. 68.) Walker admits that it is impossible to ascertain how many of the Dutch immigrants were Anabaptists, and that the early Separatists seem to have had no feeling of indebtedness to them. (Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, p. 27.) Neither the Lollard nor Anabaptist theory, it will be remembered, seems to suggest Lutheranism.

[66] Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, pp. 7-8.

selves Separatists abroad.[67] The fugitives went to various continental cities, but found Calvin's welcome to Geneva the most encouraging, because the Protestant cities of northern Germany could not tolerate their nonconformity "to Luther's views of the Lord's Supper." As Walker has shown, Calvin "endeavored, though without success, to heal the breach between the adherents of the English Prayer-book of Edward VI and their more radical opponents in the exiled congregation at Frankfort. Though his sympathies were with its critics, the English service seemed to him, at worst, to be chargeable only with 'many endurable trifles.' When the Frankfort refugees divided on the issue, he welcomed to Geneva the critical wing led by John Knox."[68] But, whereas during the reign of Edward VI both Zwinglianism and Calvinism were officially favored, with the accession of Elizabeth and the return of the Marian exiles, the government attempted to keep the Anglican church in a middle course between Catholicism and Protestantism. The compromise was intolerable to the Calvinist refugees who had returned hoping to put into practice the system they had found in existence at Geneva. The result was the growth of the Puritan party, and, in the case of the more extreme followers of Calvin, Separatism.[69]

After the passing of the Act of Uniformity, many Catholic priests were disqualified, and the resulting vacancies were filled by men who, to the surprise of the authorities, desired a more complete reformation than Elizabeth would accept. "Many of these took the law into their own hands, and, in the general disorder of the times, thought themselves justified in arranging matters of ritual to suit themselves. The prevalence of such practices led to increased efforts to enforce the Act of Uniformity, and these in their turn to a more open disregard of it. In consequence, many more of the clergy were deprived, and not a few churches, especially in London were left without pastors. It was in this way that Puritanism led inevitably to Separatism."[70] As time went on and it seemed certain that there was to be no relaxation of the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity, some of the deprived ministers and other Puritans held a meeting in London in 1566 to discuss the question of the lawfulness and

[67] Burrage, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-80. It will be noticed that Separatism may be either presbyterian or congregational, since the term means only "separation from the established church."

[68] Williston Walker, *John Calvin, Organizer of Reformed Protestantism* (New York and London, 1906), pp. 390-391.

[69] Burrage, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 78-93.

[70] Selbie, *op. cit.*, p. 29. *Cf.* John Brown, *The English Puritans* (London, 1910, pp. 23-24).

necessity of separation from the Established Church. Finally, they agreed that "since they could not have the word of God preached, nor the Sacraments administered without idolatrous gear: and since there had been a separate congregation in London and another in Geneva in Mary's time, using a book and order of service approved by Calvin, which was free from the superstitions of the English service: therefore it was their duty in the present circumstances to break off from the public Churches and to assemble as they had opportunity in private houses, or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences."[71]

When the authorities broke up the meetings at Plumbers Hall in London (1567), the leaders defended themselves thus:

> So long as we might have the word freely preached and the sacraments administered without the preferring of idolatrous gear about it, we never assembled together in houses. But when it came to this, that all our preachers were displaced by your law, so that we could hear none of them in any Church by the space of seven or eight weeks, and were troubled and commanded by your courts from day to day for not coming to our parish Churches, then we bethought us what were best to do. And now if from the word of God, you can prove we are wrong we will yield to you and do open penance at St. Paul's Cross: if not, we will stand to it by the grace of God.[72]

Here is the conscientious Puritanism (of which Cartwright, as a staunch advocate of presbyterianism, is perhaps the most prominent example) that forced men gradually, and almost unwillingly at first, into the Separatist position. It is difficult to conceive of men who were so conscientiously Calvinist as to resist authority, in order to purify themselves from mere externals like "gear," accepting any form of church discipline other than the Genevan. Consequently, it seems reasonable to consider the Separatist movement, at least at first, Calvinist in church government as well as in doctrine. If we recognize that fact, this excerpt from Burrage's *The Early English Dissenters* does not come as a complete surprise:

> From the time of Robert Baillie and his contemporaries until comparatively recent years it has been the prevailing custom among historical writers to ascribe the rise and growth of separatism in England largely to the rapid spread of Continental Anabaptism. I myself formerly held this opinion, but it now appears to me much more likely that the true

[71] Quoted by Selbie, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34. *Cf.* Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
[72] Selbie, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.

source of Brownism, as well as Barrowism, is to be found in the so-called old Non-conformity, in the London Protestant congregation of Queen Mary's time, and in the views of many of the Marian exiles, as well as in the maturer opinions of later Puritans.[73]

Burrage also points out the differences in church government, as practiced by Anabaptists and Separatists.[74] Furthermore, in his *The True Story of Robert Browne,* he shows that Browne developed his primitive congregationalism from a presbyterian basis.[75] Other prominent Separatists such as Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry were never as ardently congregationalist as Browne, and, consequently, show more of the presbyterian ideas in their writings.[76]

To what extent the Pilgrims were influenced by these Separatists is difficult to say, but H. M. Dexter shows that their tendencies toward congregationalism were aspects of an emergence from Calvinist presbyterianism. The ruling eldership, originated by Calvin, was a purely presbyterian office.[77] The Pilgrims retained it, thinks Dexter, because "they were constrained by their reluctance to commit themselves to that democracy which was then so dreaded in the State, to repress the breadth and fulness of their exposition of such texts as throw the whole responsibility of the affairs of the Church, under Christ, upon the entire membership. Hence they started with the theory of five officers in every Church, namely: Pastor, Teacher, Ruler, Deacon and Deaconess"[78]—a list of officers presbyterian enough in tone to satisfy even a Calvin! Dexter adds:

> However, this may have been, that terrible "democracy" . . . was a legitimate outgrowth of the Leyden teachings, and became a practical necessity in the state in that condition of affairs in which the Plymouth Colonists vacated the Mayflower. The facts that, in the Providence of God, Robinson did not accompany his Church on its emigration, and that they failed of obtaining Mr. Crabe, while, by their hope of Robinson's following, they were long kept from choosing another Pastor, and so continued under Ruling Elder Brewster (who was practically their Pastor, although he did not administer the Sacraments), enabled the Plymouth Church to try thoroughly the experiment of a more popular government than their creed would have favored.[79]

[73] Burrage, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[75] Champlin Burrage, *The True Story of Robert Browne* (London, 1906), pp. 3, 10, 13, 15, 62, etc.
[76] Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 31-32.
[77] Dexter, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-122.
[79] Dexter, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-128.

Thus the expediency of recognizing elders as pastors did away with the Consistory and so played a large part in Pilgrim congregationalism, making of it nothing more than a development of Calvinist church discipline.

Of the Pilgrims' connection with the Massachusetts Bay colonists Burrage says:

> If the Plymouth congregation as such had any influence at all in shaping the church polity of the Puritan churches in the Massachusetts Bay colony taken as a whole, it was evidently infinitesimal. . . . Indeed, there seems to be nothing in the church organization and practice of the early New England congregations for which they were necessarily indebted to John Robinson, nor do these churches as a whole appear particularly to have studied the Plymouth model. . . . On the contrary, in so far as the traditional dominating influence of the congregation of the Pilgrim Fathers is concerned, history appears to tell us quite another story, namely, that the early Puritan congregations in New England were principally, if not wholly organized after their own ideals, while the Plymouth congregation with the passing years seems gradually to have lost altogether any distinctive character, which it may originally have possessed.[80]

Burrage and Selbie also point out that it is possible that there was very little difference between the two.[81] But whether one prefers to consider the one or the other settlement responsible for the dissemination of the democratic ideal in America, one must, it seems, recognize the Calvinist origin of both.[82]

IV

As has been shown, the authorities considered not only believe that Luther's influence tended toward absolutism and Calvin's toward democracy, but that the Pilgrims, as part of the general Separatist movement, were not Lutherans but Calvinists who derived their church government directly from presbyterianism with a possible influence from the equally non-Lutheran sources of Lollardry or Anabaptism. Moreover, it seems to be at least controversial whether the Pilgrims and Puritans were very different in their ideas

[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 358-360. *Cf.* D. S. Muzzey's "The Heritage of the Puritans," in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1920.

[81] Selbie feels that the discipline of Laud forced the Puritans into a more or less Separatist position, while Burrage maintains that the Pilgrims, by reason of the Jacobite influence, had returned almost to the original Puritan attitude by the time they sailed to the new world. See Selbie, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-66, and Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*, pp. 357-360.

[82] It should be remembered that the first representative assembly met in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619.

of church discipline; and, indeed, whether the Plymouth influence was at any time very potent. Of course, this study has of necessity been based upon the accessible secondary sources. But, the works listed by Professor Parrington seem to lead to a conclusion quite different from his own. Furthermore, none of the works studied in connection with this problem, whether mentioned by Professor Parrington or not, has suggested his point of view, with the exception of Waring's *The Political Theories of Martin Luther,* a book which cannot, I think, be accepted as sound. Consequently, the present study should establish the desirability of providing a more complete bibliography for Professor Parrington's first two chapters of *The Colonial Mind.*

FENIMORE COOPER: CRITIC OF HIS TIMES

New Letters from Rome and Paris, 1830-31

ROBERT E. SPILLER
Swarthmore College

THE ROMANTIC idealism of Cooper's novels has been noted often enough, but nowhere is this quality, in its more vigorous and direct expressions, so manifest as in his controversial prose and his personal letters. The first of these are beginning now to emerge from an undeserved obscurity following their alarmed and bitter reception on both sides of the Atlantic a century ago. The second are not so fortunate. Widely scattered, passed from hand to hand, clipped for their autographs, sold and resold, the long and interesting letters which Cooper wrote to his family and friends will perhaps never all be assembled. The papers which he left at his death contained many of them, as well as numerous note-books, but his eldest daughter, acting on a late injunction of her father, destroyed or had buried with her the most interesting of this material. Fortunately, however, his grandson has somewhat redeemed this mistaken zeal by the careful editing and publication of what was still extant at a late day.

For these reasons, any unpublished or uncollected Cooper letters have now a somewhat unusual value. The following group, dating from that period when their writer was at the height of his powers and of his popularity, have the added interest of revealing him as a commentator upon the political conditions of his times. They reflect the self-confidence of a man whose place in the world is assured by his proven abilities, but they contain as well the root of his future controversies, a haughty scorn for shallowness and hypocrisy wherever he finds them, in governments or in his fellows. Further, they are an American view of the revolutionary movements which swept central Europe about the year 1830.

In 1826 Cooper took his family abroad in order that his daughters might have the advantages of European schools. This was his chief professed purpose, but the pleasure which lay "concealed in the bottom of the cup" not infrequently acted to prolong the stay, until it stretched to more than seven years; and the same motive led to excursions and visits which were well aside from his first and limited purpose. A year in France was followed by a brief residence

in London, a winter in Rome, and frequent shorter trips in Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. In June, 1830, Cooper returned to Paris to witness a contest for liberty in which his friend of many years, Lafayette, took a leading part. It was during this period that he engaged in those controversies in the press of three countries which led to his later lawsuits and his disfavor with his public. His wide interest in the progress of popular liberty in all nations, as well as his impetuous—almost bigoted—fearlessness, are apparent in the following letters.

For many reasons political events in Europe in the years 1830-31 were watched with a vital interest by Americans. The July Revolution of 1830 had forced the Bourbon Charles X into exile, placed the Orleans Louis Philippe, with his affected bourgeois sympathies, on the throne of France, and raised Lafayette to a position of great influence as head of the reorganized National Guard. Encouraged by this overthrow of the monarchical régime established by the Congress of Vienna, Belgium revolted from her enforced dependence upon the throne of the Netherlands, and the echoes of popular unrest were once again heard in Germany, Italy, and England. In the latter country, the Reform Bill of 1831-2 owes much to the same stirring of popular consciousness.

In America, the "reign" of Andrew Jackson was at its height and the "people" controlled the political stage. The significance of this condition, to Cooper, was great. An aristocrat by birth and in his social attitude, he was as violent a democrat as Jackson in his political philosophy. The conflict of these two sympathies is everywhere apparent in his writings, and he denied allegiance to either political party. In spite of his Jeffersonian fear of monarchy, he is never in complete sympathy with the facts of popular government. The son of old Judge William Cooper, landed proprietor of a vast wilderness, had too much social pride in his blood to be a good Jacksonian. Even his testament on the subject, *The American Democrat* (1838), pleads, in as unmistakable terms as those of Carlyle, for an aristocracy of worth. He was more at home in European society than in American, but American political philosophy has had few more vigorous defenders on foreign shores.

The winter of 1830 found Cooper in Rome, and a letter, addressed from that city to Charles Wilkes on January 6, reflects his study of European civilization and his battles with the English quarterlies. As yet there are little more than clouds on the political horizon:

My dear Sir:

I received your obliging letter not long before we quitted Naples. Since then we have been so much in motion that I have not had a good opportunity to answer it. Indeed I write now, from a sense of a *business duty*. I have just written to Carey and enclosed an order on you, for the longest of the notes given on account of Wish-ton-Wish. I mean the three year note for $500—I thought it proper to advise you of this order, and I write, at a very inconvenient moment, for that purpose. In a few weeks I shall give you the trouble to read another of my scrawls, to a different effect.

When I got here I found the Edinburgh of June last. It has an article on Hall and the "Notions." This article[1] I am now answering, in a letter from Cadwallader to the Editor, who I sincerely hope is not Jeffrey. I think I see the stale witticisms of Sidney Smith in the article, let who will be the Editor. I think I have got the best of it, as to true [*sic*], argument and if I must say it, wit, or perhaps witticism would be a better word for us both. I am so fully persuaded of a design to brow beat us, that I have thought this reply necessary, and I am strongly of opinion, it will produce a good effect. The truth is so clearly with me, that it requires no great ingenuity to cast any of them, on the subject of America.

My next tale, Water Witch is ready, but the Roman Government wont let me print, on account of this expression, which unfortunately occurs in the first chapter. "And Rome itself is only to be traced by mutilated arches and fallen columns." Here are thin-skinned gentry for you! The rogues wish to make their people think Rome is still Rome.[2]

There is no end to the Americans who come here. Schermerhorn, Grinnell, the two —— [?] and a long list of others have just gone, while Miss Douglass and another troup have just arrived. A gentleman told me he counted a group of twenty seven, the other day, in St. Peters.

Rome has been covered with snow for several days, and the Romans think the season extraordinary. I have not yet had the luck to meet with an ordinary season in Europe.

C. Wilkes, Esq. [signature clipped]

Charles Wilkes, a New York banker and a friend of long standing, was apparently Cooper's American financial agent at this time. His answer to this letter, as well as that to the later letter from Cooper included in this article, are printed in the *Correspondence* of the latter, but the letters themselves had been missing until they turned up in an auction house a few years ago and were acquired

[1] A joint review, by William Empson, of Cooper's *Notions of the Americans* and Captain Basil Hall's *Travels in North America, Edinburgh Review* (June, 1829), XLIX, 473-525.

[2] The printed passage reads: "and Rome itself is only to be traced by fallen temples and buried columns."

by the present writer. In his reply, Wilkes rightly expresses confidence that the author of the Edinburgh article could not have been Jeffrey.

During his four months' residence in London in 1828, Cooper had been entertained frequently by the poet Samuel Rogers, at his home on St. James's Place. Three years later, January 19, 1831, he addressed a long letter to Rogers[3] from Paris, telling him what he had been doing and thinking in the interim, during which the July revolution had taken place and the "furor of moderation" of Louis Philippe and his party had already begun to wear a little thin:

My dear Sir,—So long a time has elapsed since we parted, that I am almost afraid to write to you, though the object of my letter is a tardy but sincere expression of the grateful recollection of all your kindnesses when in London. I did write to you with the same intent from Florence early in 1829, but some circumstances have led me to infer that by an oversight the letter was never sent—an accident of by no means rare occurrence in my correspondence. Both Mrs. Cooper and myself retain a pleasant remembrance of your good offices, and I ought to add, your good nature, while we were sojourners in the wilderness of your capital. I am willing to flatter myself with the impression that you still feel sufficient interest in our welfare not to shut your ears against an account of what we have been about during the last four years.

From London, as you may remember, possibly, we went to Holland, and, after a short delay in Paris, to Switzerland, where we passed the summer. In the autumn we crossed the Alps. Our stay in Italy extended to near two years, and we left it by the Tyrol for Germany. After the late revolution we came back here for the purpose of giving our girls, of whom there are four, the advantages of the masters. I regret to say that my nephew, whom you may remember, a tall stripling, and who grew into a handsome man, died of consumption in September last. Little Paul often speaks of the Parc St. Jacques, and Monsieur Rogers, and of an old woman who sold fresh milk in your neighborhood. I do not know that you ought to be much flattered by the association, but you will at least admit that it is natural.

I continue, as George III said to Johnson, to "scribble, scribble, scribble," though with something less of advantage to mankind than was the case with the great moralist. In one sense, however, I am quite his equal, for I do as well as I can. Since I saw you I have published three tales, and am now hard at work at a fourth. The last was on a subject connected with Italy, the scene being in Venice, and I frequently stimulated the imagination by reading your own images and tales of that part of Europe. I

[3] P. W. Clayden, *Rogers and His Contemporaries*, 2 vols. (London, 1889), II, 12-18.

know nothing of its reception among you, though I fancy there will be a disposition to drive me back again into my own hemisphere. There is a good deal of Falstaff's humour about me in the way of compulsion, and so I may prove hard-headed enough to try my hand again. Some one told me that I was accused of presumption for laying the scene of a story in a town rendered immortal by Shakespeare and Byron. Luckily there is a sort of immunity that is peculiarly the right of insignificance, and I confess that the idea of invading the domains of your great poets never crossed my brain. I had a crotchet to be delivered of, and produced it must be, though it were stillborn. I am far from certain that it ought to be imputed as a crime to any man that he is not Shakespeare or Scott, so I shall go on with the confidence of innocence.

I heard through Mr. Wilkes that the picture which I wished you to accept as a feeble testimony of my recollection of your kindness was sent, and I hope it was not a bad specimen of the artist's talent, which I take to be of a very high order. I hear he is doing wonders, and that he is attracting notice in Italy. He is studying the figure, they tell me, with signal success. I picked up a little picture the other day in the open streets that is generally much esteemed. It is a female portrait of the time of Louis XIV, of the Flemish school, we think, and certainly an original from the hand of some eminent painter. I do not remember a dozen better portraits, though it is something the worse for exposure and time. It cost me just a guinea! The only account I can find of it is a sort of tradition in a family that owned it thirty years that it is a portrait, by Teniers, of his own wife. The manner of Teniers is what may be termed silvery, and that of my portrait is rather in the style of Correggio. It is exquisitely drawn and coloured, but the face strikes everybody as being decidedly German, or at least Flemish. Could you help me to a hint, to a print, or to any book that would be likely to throw light on the matter.

Wonderful changes have occurred since I had the pleasure of seeing you, but I think greater still are in store. Is not the tendency of the present spirit obvious? and ought not your aristocracy to throw themselves into the stream and go with the current, rather than hope to stem a torrent that in its nature is irresistible? If your system of Government has had its advantages in its pliable character (and it certainly has avoided many great dangers by quietly assuming new shades of policy), it has also one great and menacing disadvantage, that I do not see how it can resist. The contradiction between theory and practice has left your controlling power exposed to the unwearied and all-powerful attacks of the press, for though treason can [not] be written against the king the aristocracy has no such protection. The idea of defending any limited body by the press against the assaults of the press seems a desperate experiment, for, right or wrong, there is but one means of keeping physical force and political power asunder, and that is the remedy of ignorance. To me at this distance it

seems an inevitable consequence of your actual social condition that both your church establishment and your peerage must give way. America might furnish a useful example to warn the English aristocracy if they would consent to study it. Our gentry put themselves in opposition to the mass, after the revolution, simply because, being in the habit of receiving their ideas from the most aristocratic nation of our time, they fancied there were irreconcilable interests to separate the rich man from the poor man, and that they had nothing to expect from the latter class should it get into the ascendant. They consequently supported theories adverse to the amalgamation. and as a matter of course, the instinct of the multitude warned them against trusting men opposed to their rights. The error has been discovered, and although individuals among those who were prominent in supporting exclusive doctrines are necessarily proscribed by opinion, the nation shows all proper deference to education and character; when these are united to money and discreetly used they are of necessity still more certain of notice. Jefferson was the man to whom we owe the high lesson that the *natural* privileges of a social aristocracy are in truth no more than their *natural* privileges. With us, all questions of personal rights, except in the case of the poor slaves, are effectually settled, and yet every really valuable interest is as secure as it is anywhere else.

It is curious to note the effect of the present condition of England. When the prerogative was in the ascendant, Charles made six Dukes of his illegitimate sons (Monmouth included), and George IV scarce dared own his progeny. Even the first of the Hanoverian princes presumed to make a Duchess of his mistress, but all that power disappeared before the increasing ascendency of the nobles. Now the many and the few are in opposition, the King comes into the account, and we hear of lords and ladies among his offspring. A bold and able monarch would in such a crisis regain his authority, and we should again hear the phrase, *"Le roi y pensera."* The experiment would be delicate, but it might succeed by acting on the fears of the middle classes, the fundholders, and the timid. With the cast of character that has actually been made by Providence, I think, however, there is little probability that the drama will receive this *dénouement.*

Here we have just got out of the *provisoire.* The *furor* of moderation is likely enough, I think, to put us all back again. There is an unfortunate and material distinction between the interests of those who rule and those who are ruled to come in aid of the floundering measures of the ministry. The intentions of the *"juste milieu"* are obviously to make the revolution a mere change of dynasties, while the people have believed in a change of principles. Could the different sections of the Opposition unite, the present state of things would not endure a month. Neither the National Guard nor the Army is any security against a great movement, for they are more likely to go against the Government than with it. There have been some

very serious steps taken in the courts here of late which look grave. The judges have exercised a right of sentencing prisoners that a jury had acquitted. There is probably some show of law for the measure, but it is a very grave and hazardous course. On the whole, I am of opinion that King Louis Philippe's Civil List may be worth some two or three years' purchase. I would not give him three.

But I am boring you with politics, when apology for writing at all is the most material matter. Mrs. Cooper desires to be remembered to Miss Rogers and yourself, and I beg also to be mentioned to your sister. I should like exceedingly, did you not think it encroaching on your good nature, to be mentioned to Dr. and Mrs. Somerville.

I can tell you nothing of Parisian society, not having dined or passed an evening out of my own house in five months. Nobody comes to see me, and I go to see nobody, or next to nobody. I have a pleasant and happy fireside of my own, and am quite content. I should be very glad to see you among us. There was a report some time since that you were about to visit Paris, and I had hopes to meeting you here. Perhaps you did come, and I was ignorant of your presence, for I am so much out of the world that it might very well happen. Should you not have been, and should you in truth come, I trust you will take the trouble to send a card with your address to me, and I add my street and number not to miss the occasion of seeing you.

Believe me, dear Sir,
Very truly and faithfully yours,
J. Fenimore Cooper.
Rue St. Dominique St. Germain, No. 59

Captain William Branford Shubrick, to whom the next letter is addressed from Paris, May 1, 1831, was perhaps Cooper's most loyal friend in the Navy. This letter and the following one are now in the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, having been presented by their recipients to Mr. Robert Gilmor, of Baltimore, although they reached their present location by devious channels.

My dear Shubrick:

I got your letter with the documents in good season, and thank you for both. I shall take to myself the merit of writing an answer immediately and of predicting, therein, that you would be promoted, though unluckily for my reputation as a prophet, I forgot to send it. I am glad to see, however, that the government is more mindful of you, and that you are at last where you ought to be. I hope to live to see you an Admiral. If you see anything of Finch congratulate him, also, in my name.[4]

[4] A manuscript autobiographical sketch by Shubrick in the collections of the Library of Congress reads: "In 1831 was promoted to the rank of Captain and was employed on various duties, among others that of inspector of Ordnance and Ammunition for the Navy until 1838." He was later promoted to the rank of Commodore.

Here, there is an appearance of calm, though I have little faith in its duration. God knows what will come next, but something different from the present state of things, I think must follow. The people in power in France, have completely cheated the people out of their liberty, and are aiming now at an Aristocracy. They will keep a King as a cloak, but the English system is their aim, and it is odd enough they are striving hardest to imitate England, just as England is about to change her government. If we are not, already, we shall soon be the oldest government in Christendom.

As to ourselves in Europe, it is a thousand pities that the Government at home did not know their people better. When Gen. Jackson came into power it was with a formidable character for decision and an inclination to make the flag respected. Now, to us in Europe, it seems that he or his friends for him, have done all they can to strip him of this reputation, which was precicely [*sic*] the reputation we wanted. I do not say he should have blustered, but I do say, they might have left the man a character for the only quality by which he was at all honored, on this side of the water. So far from France fearing him, now, or his presupposed resolution doing us any good, the French Government considers him as only anxious to secure his re-election, by keeping at peace. So much for his supererogatory professions. I much fear that Mr. Van Buren is not suited to his vocation.

I tell *you* but it is to go no further, that I think our claims on France are at a crisis. I lean to the opinion that they will be satisfied, but it is far from sure. Will King Andrew fight, think you?—There may be occasion.

I may come home this summer, but if I do it will be alone. We have taken a house at Paris for a year, and I shall not cross the ocean with my girls till they are ready to appear. They are just beginning to finish off—that is to say the eldest.

I see by the American papers that we are represented as being in constant tumults here. Now all these accounts are absurd. The riots amounted to very little, and their importance has been measured by the *fears* of the government, rather than by the truth. I have seen but one day in eight months, that I thought there was the danger of any thing serious. Today and yesterday and even the day before there have been crowds round the column of the Place Vendome, hanging garlands to the bas relief in honor of Bonaparte, but, there is no rioting or any other movement than this manifestation of interest in the principles of the Empire.

As for the illustrious Louis Philippe it is my private opinion he is no better than he should be. He has kept Sebastiani, as false a politician as Europe affords, near him through all the changes, and that in itself is as bad a sign as need be. Then he began with great affectations of Republican simplicity, and now he is coming gradually to all the pomp of Royalty. I went to see him, one night, with Lafayette and McLane, and even then, six months ago, I thought him a hypocrite. We had a droll time of

it. He asked us to dine with him, and so Lafayette, who did much as he pleased then, determined to make a job of it, and he got the Queen to receive all the American ladies (who would go, under such circumstances) in the evening. There was a burlesque reception—half royal and half republican—the King and Queen wishing us all to the devil the whole time, and there the matter ended. Of course Mrs. Cooper did not go. You may imagine what sort of a mummery it was, by the fact that a Lady was kept serving in the corner of the room, as a sort of evidence how simple they were. The amusing part of it to me was to observe how cross the gentlemen and ladies in waiting were for the name of America is wormwood to these gentry. I was standing in the door-way one night—after one of our visits to the Palais Royal, for Lafayette took me there three or four times, when a Chamberlain who had been impatiently waiting some time to get by Lafayette, exclaimed close to me, not knowing that I was of the party, "Adieu l'Amerique." I wanted no more than this to forsee the fate of Lafayette's power, the moment the King could get secure in his seat. In about a month they trunelled him, neck and heel, from the command of the National Guards. If I were with you, I could tell you many curious things, but I will not commit them to paper, for fear of accident. As your promotion will probably keep you at home some time longer, we may have the opportunity ere long.[5]

I am glad you like the sec. part of the Water Witch. It is a book rather for sailors than landsmen, and I never knew how it was received. Carey intimates that it has done pretty well, but I should infer from his letter not as well as Rover. I think it a better book, though I might change my opinion on reading them over like an ordinary person. I remember the passage of the Wasp through Hell Gate very well. I had left the ship at Whitestone and was dining at Gibb's place when she came down. I had also the benefit of poor Nick's description which beats mine greatly. The best thing in Water Witch (and it is the truest and best nautical bit I have ever done) is the running into the cove and anchoring. Now, to my fancy, Master Billy, that is a bit of ship. One can feel the surges of the cable, and hear the grumbling of the bitts.

As to my having your wife in my eye, when the last chapter was written, that is a great secret, you may tell Madame Harriet.

I don't know whether you were ever at Venice?—I think not, however. When I was there this time twelve month, the place took such a deep hold of my fancy, that I have been obliged to disburthen it in a tale. It is in press and will appear in July. I have not yet decided on the name, but believe it will be "Bravo." I find Monk Lewis had a story called "The Bravo

[5] This "republican" reception to the Americans is more fully, if not more humorously, described by Cooper in his note-book. *Cf. Putnam's Magazine* (February, 1868), n. s., II, 167-172.

of Venice," which may induce me to choose another title. After this I am "under articles" to do Lake Ontario, with Indians and sailors intermixed.

I was attacked the other day, By the Duke of Fitzjames, a Frenchman of some note, for making the captain of the French Coquette in Water Witch a "poor devil" as he expressed it—un pauvre diable. My answer was, that I was obliged to give the victory to my own hero—this he admitted—and that I found myself reduced to make him flog either a *good* French sailor or a *bad* French sailor, and that I was not going to do the former even to oblige him. This got the laugh on my side.

I suppose now you have got port rank that you will have nothing to do at home, except to spend the people's money. Why not come over here, for the winter. Brun travels with his wife, and what a Lieutenant can do, a Captain can surely get along with. You might lodge very well for $50 a month—living would cost your family about fifty francs or ten dollars a week if you kept a cook, and twenty if you did not. A thousand dollars would give you and Madame Harriet such a view of human nature as you have never had yet. I would keep you out of harm's way, a thing very necessary for a young gentleman of forty at Paris, and Mrs. Cooper would be very glad to show Mrs. S— the milliner's &c. &c. Think of this, let me know your mind.

I do not think your cousin Miss Pinckney—I suppose her to be your cousin—a philosopher. As you very justly remark it is easy enough to see the fallacy of her reasoning. But all your people are a little mad on the subject of the tariff. It is odd that they do not see that their interests are secured by having manufactures in the country. What would they do in the event of an English war? Now they are sure of a market for a great deal of their produce, and I believe that in two years they will cry out for protection louder than did Burgess, who I perceive has been talking an hour and a half about them, after dinner!

If you want to see a good article on the Navy (in the shape of a pamphlet) you must endeavor to send me all the Documents you can lay your hands on. I want particularly to know what was the greatest number of seamen employed, *at any one time,* during the last war. This fact will be of material use to me—as will all similar facts connected with the service from 1812 to 1815. I have been impatiently waiting for the returns of the Census, without which I cannot do exactly with my statements as I could wish.

I should like also to know what proportion of seamen are necessary to such a ship as the Delaware and the war-complement of her Lieutenants. It would be useful also to be able to refer to some known official Document as authority for all this.

Now if you bluejackets will take the means to put me in the way of knowing these facts clearly, I think I may promise you a gratifying pamphlet.

Poor Hoffman! I am heartily sorry for him, nor do I think he will be entirely laid aside.

Mrs. Cooper sends kind things to your wife, in which I desire to unite. Tell her not to covet the fine things of Paris, since a Baltimore lady went to court this winter in a *Baltimore dress* and she looked as well as any of them.

Capt. W. B. Shubrick,
U. S. N.

Adieu—yours ever
J. Fenimore Cooper.

J. S. Skinner, the recipient of the next letter, was a prominent citizen of Baltimore and editor of the *American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine*. This letter is likewise dated from Paris, two months later, June 26, 1831:

Dear Sir:

I received your two letters, by Dr. Frick, some time since. I was very happy to make the acquaintance of this gentleman, who came introduced also from others of my friends. You have forgotten that we consulted our own gratification in seeking the society of Mrs. Skinner, though it is quite natural, under the circumstances, that you should attach more importance to these little civilities, than you would have done had they taken place at home. Mrs. Skinner was so entirely domesticated among the Lafayettes and their connexions that she wanted countenance from no one else, and, indeed, so much so, as to enable us to see as much of her as we could have wished. We are glad to see that she arrived safe, and Mrs. Cooper desires me to say that she wrote to her at Havre, but presumes that she did not get the letter. We both wish to congratulate her on return home, with the best good wishes for her future health and happiness. We are almost sorry we did not go with her, but hope to be only one season behind her. Something very extraordinary must occur to prevent our return next summer. I have had a very strong wish to visit the whole Mediterranean coast before I quitted Europe, but I have now changed my plan for one which will be more agreeable to all my family. After getting reestablished in the good solid republick once more, I hope to be able to collect some five or six friends who will be willing to join me in chartering or purchasing a ship to make the voyage at our leisure and to bring back such articles of curiosity or interest as we may be able to collect. I think a year would be sufficient for the coasts of France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Egypt, and the Barbary towns, so homeward without a quarantaine—sailing and arriving in the spring. At present this is my day dream, though God knows whether it will ever be realized.

What you have said concerning the practicability of seizing this opportunity to plant real liberty in Europe is very just, but your opinion of those who rule in this hemisphere is much too favorable. Selfishness is

at the bottom of all they do, the surprising audacity with which setts of men, or castes, act in their own behalf is not the least curious study of a stranger. There is a deep conspiracy of Aristocrats who are now striving to keep all they can from the people in England and France. All are not liberal who seem so, and the Reform Bill, in England, is a forced concession, artfully contrived to appear to yield a great deal more than it actually does. Without the vote by Ballot, the Reform, considered solely as a constitutional measure will do little for the people, though success in this case may embolden them to extort more from their masters, you can have no idea of the timidity—the word is not strong enough—the cowardice of the Aristocrats who tremble to-day lest a popular rising should break the bubble of their ascendency, and to-morrow some small advantage will encourage their insolence. It is nothing new, you know, for the man that has been thoroughly frightened to begin to bluster when the danger is over.

I think France far from settled—I think a war inevitable though it may be deferred, a little, in that I think Europe rapidly approaching towards a tremendous struggle. The professions of peace in the governments I disregard. Circumstances are stronger than the governments and circumstances will conquer. By the press you can form no accurate opinion of the state of Europe, except as it is symptomatick in extreme cases. The corruption of the English press is a matter of flagrant notoriety. Don Miguel had two journals hired in his service, and it is said that Nicholas has one. As for the Times its arguments and statements change with a hardihood of impudence that none but a constant observer can credit. I do assure you that the worst tergiversations of Noah's journal[6] are light compared to those of the Times. There is a constant attention in all the English journals to the interests of England which compels them to sacrifice truth and principle. Were an English journal to slight these interests, which are vital to the nation, no Englishman would read it. Necessity has taken place of instinct with the whole nation, and the meanest laborer has more or less of the theory which upholds their monopolies although he may not know it himself. Nothing is of more importance to us, than that we should understand the character of all intelligence which comes through England as source from which unhappily we derive too much. Our most important interests are opposed to each other, and yet nearly half of our reasoning on internal affairs is of English dictation. That much money is employed among us to make us think as suits English interests I am quite convinced and if you will reflect, for a moment, on the facility, with which this can be done, you will agree with me turn the table on them directly we cannot, for we have no one to pay, and

[6] Mordecai M. Noah was the eccentric and belligerent editor of *The New York Enquirer*, which was merged in 1829 with *The New York Courier*, continuing under the joint title of *The New York Courier and Enquirer*, with Noah as assistant editor.

without money nothing is done in England. We are strong in the right, and that must constitute our force.

I am glad you are satisfied with the anecdote about Washington. I have wished to contradict the story for a long time, but could not in consequence of the delicate situation of Mr. de Lancey, who served against his native country in the revolution. His death in 1828, removed this obstacle, and Mrs. Skinner was good enough to say you would accept it. It was not misplaced in your pages, being a sporting anecdote.[7]

I am a member of the Jockey Club of New York, and take great interest in all manly sports. As for horse racing, I think it very desirable it should be in the hands of gentlemen, and that every man of character should take an interest in it. I hope your work will continue to prosper. Baltimore is the very place for it—a sort of half-way-house between the southern and northern states, and the more we can bring the men of education together in America, the better for us all. We have only our-

[7] The article to which Cooper refers was published in the *Turf Register*, II, 369-371, and dated from Paris, January 28, 1831. The anecdote about Washington follows:

"Mr. J. P. De Lancey, though of a well known American family, was regularly educated for the British army, in which he received a commission at eighteen. In 1774 he was quartered at Philadelphia, with a part of his corps, the 18th, or the Royal Irish. Washington was then a delegate in congress, and, in consequence of his having dined with the mess of the 18th, and of the intercourse which naturally existed between gentlemen of the different provinces, through their family connexions and acquaintances, Mr. De Lancey had a perfect knowledge of his person. When the army of Howe was preparing to embark for the Chesapeake, a corps of riflemen was organized, by drafting picked men from the different regiments, and was placed under the command of Major Ferguson, who had invented several improvements in the rifle, and who had acquired great skill in the use of that weapon. Of this corps, Mr. De Lancey was appointed the second in command. During the manoeuvres which preceded the battle of Brandywine, these riflemen were kept skirmishing, in advance of one of the British columns. They had crossed some open ground, in which Ferguson was wounded in the arm, and had taken a position in the skirt of a thick wood. While Mr. De Lancey was occupied in arranging a sling for the wounded arm of Ferguson, it was reported that an American officer of rank, attended only by a mounted orderly, had ridden into the open ground, and was then within point-blank rifle shot. Two or three of the best marksmen stepped forward, and asked leave to bring him down. Ferguson peremptorily refused; but he went to the skirt of the wood, and, showing himself, menaced the American with several rifles, while he called to him, and made signs for him to come in. The mounted officer saw his enemies, drew his rein, and sat, looking at them attentively, for a few moments. A serjeant now offered to hit the horse, without injuring the rider. But Ferguson still withheld his consent, affirming, that it was Washington reconnoitering, and that he would not be the instrument of placing the life of so great a man in jeopardy, by so unfair means. The horseman turned, and rode slowly away. When the British army reached Philadelphia, Mr. De Lancey was promoted to a majority, in another corps, and Ferguson, not long after, went to the south, where he was killed, at King's mountain. To the last moment, Major Ferguson maintained that the officer, whose life he had spared, was Washington, and it is probable that the story in circulation has proceeded from this opinion. But, on the other hand, Mr. De Lancey, to whom the person of Washington was necessarily so well known, constantly affirmed that his commander was mistaken. I have often heard Mr. De Lancey relate these circumstances, and though he never pretended to be sure of the person of the unknown horseman, it was his opinion, from some particulars of dress and stature, that it was the Count Pulaski."

selves to rely on, for depend upon it, Europe to a nation is against us. If there be an exception it is Russia, and that from manifest interest. Europe is not pleased in seeing a quarter of the world, that has so long been subservient to its views rising in rivalry and asserting natural truths in opposition to its own sophistication.

May I trouble you with a little commission? Mr. Gilmor has patronized a Mr. Greenough of Boston, a sculptor, who, on all occasions, speaks gratefully of his support. I wrote to Mr. Gilmor on the subject of Mr. Greenough's prospects and success two years since, from Florence, but I find the letter among my papers, it having been mislaid. Were I ambitious of the reputation of a prophet, I should send it, for I find prognostics concerning Europe which time has already fulfilled. Among other expressions this—unless reform marches briskly in England it will be overtaken by revolution. My motive in writing, however, was to express my own pleasure in the aid he had given Mr. Greenough, and to inform him that it was entirely merited. A more excellent young man there is not, and I think he is in a fair way to make a capital artist. Since then he has finished for me a group of cherubs which are now in America, exhibiting for his benefit, and I refer with confidence to their execution as justifying all I have said. Will you say this much for me to Mr. Gilmor? Could not something be got for him to do from government? Surely, if he were not what in truth he is, an excellent sculptor, a second rate work by an American should have more value than a second rate work by a foreigner. I have a respect for Mr. Persico, who is a deserving man, but the U. States could do something for Greenough without worrying Mr. Persico. No private individual can command a groupe or even a statue of the noble kiud, and until he can get some such thing, Greenough will not have an opportunity of making a name.

With best regards to Mrs. Skinner and Thoderick

I remain, dear Sir,

Your Obl. Friend

J. Fenimore Cooper[8]

The second letter to Charles Wilkes comes from Paris also and is endorsed, probably by its recipient, "29 Sept. 1831." In the meantime, the Belgian revolution had taken place:

My dear Sir:

I have sent to Messr. Carey and Lea, another book, and they will forward to you, as usual, the notes. Should exchange get to be favorable I

[8] A note at the foot of the page, signed R. Gilmor, states that this letter was given by Skinner to him in 1831, and that he, acting upon Cooper's suggestion, gave Greenough an order *carte blanche* for a statue. Greenough made for him the statue of Medora and later was commissioned to do the statue of Washington for the Capitol.

should be glad to receive the proceeds of these notes, with a view to invest in France, but should it continue high I do not care much about it.

Mrs. Cooper and myself are about to quit Paris for twenty days, to take an excursion on the Rhine. We start on Monday, and go via Dieppe, Arras, Lille, and Bruxelles. The Belgian question is far from settled but we think the truce of six weeks will answer for our purposes. You probably do not know how near we were to a war. The facts are these, my information coming from the best sources.

I am on good terms with an English Lady, who is a niece of the late Lord Hastings—our Lord Rawdon. She is the wife of the second son of the present Duke of Bedford, Lord William Russell—Lord William has been employed in the Belgian business, and Lady William has read to me his letters to her. They state as follows.

The French were called in by Leopold, as you know. The Dutch had advanced to Louvain, carrying all before them. The Belgians made no stand at all. At Louvain, however, their new King rallied all of them that were left, and endeavoured to make them fight. Seeing that they would not, it became necessary to strike the Dutch by some other means. The Prince of Orange was in front, driving on the Belgian advance parties, and approaching the town rapidly, while a powerful column under Duke Bernard of Sax-Weimar was in its rear, completely cutting off retreat. The French were a day's march on the flank.

Lord William went out attended by a Belgian Lieutenant and a trumpet. They were completely under the fire of the Dutch artillery, and the trumpeter was so frightened he could not blow. The Lieutenant showed his handkerchief, which was so dirty the enemy did not recognize it as a white flag. In the end the Lieutenant's horse was killed. But Lord William reached the Prince of Orange in safety, having the consolation of knowing matters might have been worse, as a Dutch artillery officer, to whom he complained of their firing on a flag, said that had he known it was a flag, he should have fired grape. The Prince and Lord William had served together in Wellington's family in Spain. The former received his old comrade well, behaving as Lord William expresses it "like an angel." In other words he suffered himself to be persuaded into a halt. But he complained bitterly. "In an hour I shall have Leopold and all his army"—he said, "and I have no orders! It is true we do not wish to fight France, but, my dear William, see in what a situation you place me!" The Prince was very much agitated, but consented in the end to give Lord William an aide, with orders for the Duke Bernard, to heighten the character of his moderation. The Prince had just had a horse killed under him.

Lord William set off, with the Dutch aide to meet the column behind the town. This duty was not performed without a great deal of difficulty, and their horses were completely smoked up, when they fell in with the

rear of the column. They literally could go no farther, and fresh horses were provided. When they did get up with the head of the column, they found Duke Bernard in a great rage. According to Lord William he cursed largely, and finished by saying that he was "honteux d'etre beau frere du roi de l'Angleterre." However, he was obliged to halt, and time was given to make the armistice.

Had the Prince of Orange gone on, Louvain would have been carried by assault, beyond a doubt, many lives would have been lost, and as the French mediation would have been despised, Gerard, or rather the young Princes, who were in advance and burning to flick their maiden swords, would have attempted to have driven them out. As the French were not very strong in front they would probably have been flogged, at first, and the Prince of Orange would have gone into Brussels with little opposition. After which we should have seen Prussia, and I think England, in the field.

The cholera is said to be coming down upon us. I suspect a good deal of exaggeration on the subject of this disease, for the peace party embraces what is called the conservative party, and that is composed of all who get the benefit of the present order of things, and who of course wish to continue their monopolies. Now there is no one thing which has so much influence in cooling the ardent, just now, as the approach of cholera.

I was sorry to see that Mr. Simond has paid the great debt. It is reported that he has left many papers on the subject of America, and that one of his friends is about to publish them.[9] You know my opinion of a foreigner's judgment of America, and least of all a Frenchman's. The book of Captain Hall has satisfied me that a stranger can scarcely understand our facts when he gets them. You will tell me that Mr. Simond was not a stranger—but did he live in the society of the country? I understand Mrs. Cooper that he scarcely ever saw anybody but foreigners. Apropos of Capt. Hall, I have sent a thick article to the New Monthly, on the subject of his book, (at the repeated and earnest request of Colburn) and by that you will see how easy it is to draw a coach and six through his facts. "Figures can not lie," and I have given a specimen of his accuracy in respect to statistics—I do assure you, that it would not be difficult to cut up nearly all of his facts, in the manner you will there see. I never saw so faulty a book. Even Mr. De Roos[10] is not so bad, and yet I agree with you that, on the whole, viewed apart from his colouring, his facts are in our favour. They say here (I mean the English people) that

[9] Louis Simond was a Frenchman who spent a number of years in the United States and published books of travel in England, Italy, and Switzerland, 1815-1822. His notes on America do not seem to have been published.

[10] *Personal Narrative of Travels in the United States and Canada in 1826 . . . with remarks on the present state of the American Navy,* by Frederick F. de Roos. 3rd edition, London, 1827. Cooper's article appeared anonymously in *The New Monthly* (October, 1831), XXXII, 297-311.

he was regularly employed to write his book, and that he got it up with a direct eye to preferment. This has not been my opinion of his character, though there is a small cavilling in his manner of arguing, that looks like special pleading. Thus, for instance, where he pretends that our institutions can only date from the time when the mode of choosing Presidents was altered, in order to obviate the embarrassment which arose in the case of Jefferson and Burr. There is a good deal of the pettifogger in this manner of reasoning, if reasoning it can be called.

Since writing the above, we have made our tour and are returned. We went by Dieppe, Abbeville, Arras, Douay, Tournai, Ath, Bruxelles, Liege, Aix la Chapelle, Cologne, Coblenz, Mayence, Francfurt, Darmstadt, Heidelberg, Manheim, Kaiserlautern, Sarbruck, Sarlouis, Treves, Luxembourg, Longivy, Reims, Loinons, back. On the whole we have been a thousand miles. I fell in with a bit of scenery, some old ruins, a multitude of traditions &c. in Rhenish Bavaria, that will cost me a book.[11] We were twenty days post. Treves pleased us most by its sights, and Coblenz by its beautiful position. They drove us back from the French frontier once, on account of the cholera, but I was too old a traveller to go into a *land* quarantine. They ordered me to go for five days into a sort of gaol, and at the end of the five days I was in my own house in Paris.

I keep my opinion of the state of things in Europe. The French Ministry have preserved the peace by cheating France out of her institutions, but it will not do. They cannot restore confidence, and have made them responsible for all the evil which is a consequence of its want. It is impossible to do as much for free institutions as has been done in France, and then go back, as is evidently the wish of the Aristocratic party. Both England and France must go on by [?] or they will go on by violence. The Carlists are very bold, and I think a restoration highly probable. Nobody loves or respects this King, and the Carlists are cunningly assuming the liberal side. Thus you see that when the physical force once fairly enters into the account of a government, it must be courted by all sides, until finally the mass get their rights.

We went over the ground of the late Belgian campaign, and I must say the Dutch have left very few marks of a victorious army. We saw two or three houses and barns burnt, but nothing more. Had we not known there had been a contest, we should never have suspected it. All the Southern provinces wish to be French, even to the Rhine. The French could go to the Rhine in ten days, were they so disposed, with the good wishes of the inhabitants.

I have just left Lafayette, who is much occupied with the Peerage. It strikes me the Ministers wish to press so many offensive and objectionable projects, as to compel the chambers to take refuge in the hereditary descent. There can be no doubt that the English and French Aristocrats

[11] *The Heidenmauer* (Philadelphia, 1832).

are playing into each other's hands, as regards their own interests. I know nothing more disgusting than the pusillanimity of these gentry in moments of alarm, except it be their insolence in triumph. They pass from the "Salam God Bless me," to the "Salam God Damn you" in twenty four hours. There is no doubt, just now, that fear is the principal agent in deciding the French chamber. The majority is honest, but short-sighted, and it will end in [being] corrupted by its own measures. Enfin, the people will right themselves.

You say nothing of my old friend George. I do not know whether he is guiltless of matrimony and murder, two things which doctors commonly commit in the first years of their practice. You have doubtless heard of our new treaty with France.[12] Rives thinks he has got as much as is fairly due, excluding the interest, and I must say I think he has got rid of a very awkward claim, in disposing of the Louisiana dispute. Mr. Neuville was not so wrong, in urging that point, as I had once supposed. The Beaumarchais claim too though I have little doubt of its injustice, was so involved as to leave us no very plausible reply to it. All this is now disposed of, leaving us no unsettled point of controversy with France. Mr. Rives deserves a good deal of credit for his indefatigible efforts, for no man was ever more persevering or more firm. My only apprehension is, that in his desire to settle the affair, he may deceive himself as to the amount justly due.

Charles Wilkes, Esquire [signature clipped]

Letters as vigorous as these, and as revealing of their time and of their author, are not common. When the last of the available manuscripts in the hand of Cooper have been collected, and the travel and other controversial writings have been recalled to their relative position of importance in the sum of his work, it is probable that, to his reputation as a novelist, we shall have to add that of a social and political critic of real discernment.[13] "Posterity!" wrote his young friend Greenough when Cooper threatened to give up the writing of romances because of public criticism of his opinions, "There's the cud for you to chew while the curs are barking. On the whole I think you have better reason to be contented with your lot than any American who never entered public—I mean official—life."

[12] William Cabell Rives, M.P. and E.E. from the United States to France, negotiated the indemnity treaty of July 4, 1831, between the two countries.

[13] *Cf.* also his letter to Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale, dated from Paris, May 12, 1827, in which he summarizes his impressions of political France before the July Revolution. *Memorials of Eminent Yale Men*, by Anson Phelps Stokes (New Haven, 1914), I, 143-45.

SOME GERMAN SURVEYS OF AMERICAN LITERATURE

JOHN HERBERT NELSON
The University of Kansas

AMONG European commentators on American literature, perhaps the Germans as a group have had no equals in the disinterestedness shown in pursuing the study. It is true, much of their work consists of perfunctorily written sketches and criticisms, yet this hack work usually reflects considerable balance of judgment; not many among them have come to the investigation with a thesis to prove. The best of their number are conspicuous for their diligence in inquiry, discernment in detecting original qualities, and independence in forming estimates. Naturally the work even of these best has limitations, and is noted more for comprehensiveness than for brilliance in the handling of details. In studies of individual authors the Germans have rarely surpassed the French in insight, and often have not equaled the latter in sprightliness and readability; they have as yet produced no Baudelaire. Their writings on American authors, moreover, do not match in bulk those by the English. Yet on the one hand, they have, as a rule, been more able than the French to enter into the spirit and mental processes of the American people, predominantly Teutonic like themselves, and on the other hand, have escaped the prejudices so long shown by the British, prejudices very naturally held against a people regarded first as immature offsprings and later as rival kinsmen. Their position has been favorable for taking a large view of the subject, enabling them to discuss, with some success, American literature as an independent entity, its connections with English literature, the degree to which its qualities reflect the American spirit, its place in world literature. It should be added that German surveys of American literature, long and short, are numerous. Some account will be offered in this paper of the most important of them, and of the ones most easily accessible in the United States.

In contrast with British works of the kind, most German histories of English literature include American authors, either along with the English or in a separate section, as an allied group; and so do German accounts of world literature. Ludwig Lang's revision of Scherr's *Illustrierte Geschichte der Weltliteratur,* for example,

contains a section of ten pages, "Nordamerika"; Adolf Stern's *Geschichte der Neuern Literatur* one of twenty-eight pages, "Die Nordamerikanische Litteratur"; Peter Norrenberg's *Allgemeine Literaturgeschichte* one of about eight pages, part of the total of one hundred and fifty-eight pages devoted to English literature. In Otto Hauser's *Weltgeschichte der Literatur,* Longfellow, Poe, Hawthorne, Whitman, and other major figures are discussed in appropriate places in the division, "Die Englische Literatur." In *Die Weltliteratur im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert,* Richard Meyer takes somewhat into consideration the American contribution, particularly the influence of Whitman and the development in the field of the short story. The list of examples could be greatly extended.

The works by Stern and Scherr, just referred to, offer illustrations of criticisms by two very different types of German student working in the field; the one depending almost entirely upon his own reading and estimates, the other basing his study largely upon the judgments of other critics, although frequently adding estimates of his own as well. That Professor Stern's work is more limited in scope, and appeared, moreover, in 1885, before the better histories of American literature were written, explains some of its qualities; yet fundamentally the difference between his criticism and that in Scherr's history is one of attitude and method.

Professor Stern's chapter, "Die Nordamerikanische Litteratur,"[1] represents an extreme in the matter of critical independence, and shows a mixture of weakness and strength. An attempt at a sketch of the subject from the beginning, it nevertheless contains no treatment of Franklin, Irving, Holmes, Emerson, Hawthorne, James, Howells, or Lanier, although there are brief accounts of such authors as Frances Sargent Osgood. Many passages, however, reflect a freshness of treatment, and here and there one finds much which is provocative of thought. Poe, for instance, the author sees as "eine echt amerikanische Natur, bei welcher die Neigung zum Absonderlichen, Düstern, Geheimnisvoll-Schauerlichen mit dem Thatsachensinn, der realistischen Schärfe des Yankees zusammenfällt."[2] To Whitman he strenuously denies any great originality, pointing out that "Hundert Jahre vor Whitman haben einzelne deutsche Klopstock-Nachstammler ein ähnlich chaotisches Empfinden in frei erfundene Formen zu kleiden gesucht und in wuchtigen, aber dunkeln Worten die wogende Unbestimmtheit ihrer poetischen Vorstellungen fest-

[1] *Geschichte der Neuern Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1885), VII, 356-84.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 364.

zuhalten vermeint."[3] He sees much significance in the literature of humanitarian concern, and devotes a whole section to "Amerikanische Tendenzdichtung." His summary, in discussing the outlook for letters in the United States, is well considered. "Die ganze Entwickelung der amerikanischen Litteratur," he writes, "schliesst nicht aus, dass eine Zeit kommen könne, in der die Neue Welt zum Besitz einer von den europäischen Vorbildern und Einflüssen völlig freien Poesie gelangt. Vorderhand ist diese Zeit noch nicht gekommen."[4]

The treatment of the subject in Scherr's *Illustrierte Geschichte*[5] shows less freedom of judgment, less originality, but is well ordered and full of correct information—is, in fact, perhaps the best short account in German. Based apparently on *The Cambridge History of American Literature,* the survey affords a view of the entire field, seen in true perspective. The story begins with Captain John Smith and comes down to the present, to the days of Sinclair Lewis, Carl Sandburg, and E. A. Robinson. The minor authors are kept in their places—for example, there is none of the usual German emphasis on Bayard Taylor—and the major figures are seen in their proper light. Just estimates are given of Irving, Bryant, Hawthorne, Emerson, and Poe; of Whitman it is said: "Man würde dem 'guten grauen Dichter' unrecht tun, wollte man ihn einfach als einsamen Vorläufer einer europäischen Mode- und Tagesströmung werten. Für das traditionslose Amerika ist er wirklich ein Anfang gewesen."[6] The survey, in short, would prove useful to a beginning German student wishing for a digest of estimates of American authors by their fellow countrymen. It is of correspondingly slight value, on the contrary, to the American student looking for criticism written from a European point of view.

Essentially of a kind with this account are most treatments of American authors in German histories of English literature, although here, also, there are exceptions. One of these is found in Karl Bleibtreu's *Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert,*[7] which is somewhat out of the ordinary in the selec-

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 371.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 383.

[5] Johannes Scherr, *Illustrierte Geschichte der Weltliteratur* (11th revision, by Ludwig Lang; Stuttgart, 1926), II, 118-29.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 125.

[7] *Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1887), vol. 2. See "Die Amerikanische Poesie," pp. 394-506, and "Bret Harte," pp. 564-73. Several prose writers are discussed in the sections on English authors.

tion of both British and American authors and in the emphasis placed on them. Of the nine hundred and fifty pages of this work, about a hundred and seventy are allotted to Byron alone; more than one hundred and fifty are devoted to authors of the United States. The study lacks balance, and offers no satisfactory outline of American literary history. Except for Bret Harte, whose fiction receives particular notice, the prose writers are discussed but sketchily; attention is centered more on the poets—Bryant, Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, Poe, and numerous others, upon whom, however, the comments are for the most part tempered and discerning. Bryant is "der Dichter des Naturfriedens";[8] Emerson "hört und versteht die grosse Harmonie der Natur in ihren lautesten, wie ihren leisesten Klängen";[9] Poe is "die unläugbar grösste poetische Dichterkraft Amerikas";[10] Whitman possessed "nur eine Eigenschaft eines grossen Dichters, nämlich Originalität."[11] The general comments, while not startling, reflect solid common sense. The author feels that the American spirit has not freed itself from a certain amateurishness, and that most American books have to some extent been imitative. Differences in climate and surroundings, however, will inevitably make for a culture unlike that of the Old World. It is significant, he intimates, that a people so practical have shown a strong vein of idealism. That American life and conditions are not æsthetically ideal largely explains the poor quality of the literary works of the last few decades. Moreover, "Eine junge, aufstrebende Nation, wie diese, müsste denn doch ihre Begabung in anderer Weise bethätigen."[12]

By all odds the most important account of American authors in a German history of English literature is that in the second and revised edition of Richard Wülker's *Geschichte der Englischen Literatur,* in an appendix,[13] one hundred and twenty-nine pages long, furnished by the Stanford University professor, Ewald Flügel. This study has the virtue of containing the judgments and reactions of an outsider, and yet is firmly based on the works of native authori-

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 413.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 415.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 417.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 497.
[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 396-7.
[13] *Geschichte der Englischen Literatur* (2nd, revised ed.; Leipzig, 1907), II, 413-542. In the preface to the first edition (1896) Wülker wrote: "Eine Geschichte der amerikanischen Litteratur war von Anfang an nicht beabsichtigt. Im letzten Menschenalter hat sich diese so eigenartig und so ganz frei von England entwickelt, dass sie selbständig, nicht als Anhängsel der englischen Litteratur, behandelt werden muss."

ties. Even with this help, however, Flügel finds the last part of the story somewhat too much for him. There are too many names, too many fashions and tendencies; the record becomes a little too involved for him to see his way distinctly. He fails, for instance, to consider the short story writers as a group, or even to see the importance of the short story in America after the Civil War; he bestows as much attention on Theodore Winthrop as on Lanier, and twice as much as on Burroughs or Muir; he does little more than mention Edward Eggleston and Frank Norris, and omits the name of Hovey altogether. On the other hand, he gives an enthusiastic account of the works of Harris, points out the realistic trend in Howells, and Henry James's concern over style, writes appreciatively of the talents of Emily Dickinson, and in discussing the subject as far as the Civil War is in substantial agreement with the authorities he evidently knows: Tyler, Richardson, Wendell, and Trent. Incidentally he is familiar with the estimates of the German critics Knortz, Federn, Evans, Schonbach, and with Stedman's *American Anthology,* Duyckinck's *Cyclopaedia of American Literature,* and Stedman and Hutchinson's *Library of American Literature.*

Flügel is at his best in discussing the older books and authors, concerning whom his observations are restrained, fair, sometimes illuminating. He quotes Goethe on the subject of Franklin, "der erste grosse Nichtpuritaner,"[14] declares that the literature of the Colonial and Revolutionary eras is of concern chiefly to the historian, values Woolman's *Journal* as "eine Perle der religiösen Literatur,"[15] sees in Brown's *Wieland* "ein gewaltiges Buch für eine junge Literatur,"[16] appreciates the importance in the development of American fiction of William Austin's *Peter Rugg,* takes account of the oratory of Everett, Choate, Webster, and others, pronounces Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* the most artistic work in American literature, considers *Walden* a classic, comments on Bronson Alcott's originality, gives a just appraisal of Longfellow as the finished but unoriginal poet of the masses, stresses Lowell's work as scholar and critic, and writes with gusto of Whitman as "die eigenartigste Erscheinung der neueren amerikanischen Literatur."[17] To none of these judgments are present-day American critics likely to take exception.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 427.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 427.
[16] *Ibid.,* p. 439.
[17] *Ibid.,* p. 517.

Besides these, there are a goodly number of other judgments suggesting an individual point of view or a European attitude. Significant, perhaps, is his opinion that since Colonial times American literature "hat sich allmählich so eigenartig und so frei von der englischen entwickelt, dass der Selbständigkeit ihres Charakters auch eine Selbständigkeit der Behandlung entsprechen muss."[18] Brackenridge's *Modern Chivalry* "ist eines der frühesten und besten Produkte des amerikanischen Humors."[19] About *Uncle Tom's Cabin* he has no doubts:

> "Onkel Toms Hütte" ist eines der grossen Meisterwerke der amerikanischen Literatur, freilich ein Tendenzroman, aber ein Roman, dessen Inhalt und Form, abgesehen von jeder Tendenz, das Herz des Lesers mit solcher Gewalt ergreift, wie es seit "Werthers Leiden" kein anderes Werk der Weltliteratur getan hat.[20]

He suggests to the reader the reputation and standing of Poe in Europe: "Derjenige amerikanische Dichter der modernen Zeit, dessen hervorragender Genius zuerst von den europäischen Völkern allgemein gewürdigt wurde, war Edgar Allan Poe."[21] This habit of suggesting Old World estimates and standards shows repeatedly. The author endeavors, continually, to link American literature and European, pointing out European influences, fashions, kinships as he sees them appearing in the United States. Any manifestation of a new people, of a new national spirit, or of a new theme, also commands his attention, even when he fails to do justice to it. His interest is evidently drawn by the sectional differences between the people of the North and the South; he emphasizes the importance of the struggle over slavery; he is genuinely interested in Simms's treatment of the negro in fiction. Moreover, it is not more Simms the novelist than Simms the Southerner who concerns him. In short, Flügel makes an honest attempt to show how the literature of the United States is a commentary on and expression of civilization and life here.

Although Flügel's survey is among the best in Germany, more interest naturally attaches to those histories devoted wholly to American literature. Of these there are four:[22] by Brunnemann, Knortz, Engel, and Kellner, varying considerably in extent and worth.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 413.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 438.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 462.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 467.
[22] This leaves out of account, of course, *Die Amerikanische Literatur* (Berlin, 1912), by the American C. Alphonso Smith, who lectured on American literature at the University of Berlin in 1912.

The first of the number, by Brunnemann,[23] is a modest little volume and a pioneer book in the field. In a brief preface the author states that because of the comparative neglect of American authors by British and German historians of English literature, perhaps a brief account of them will not be unwelcome, all the more so now that all eyes are turned westward, attracted by the upheaval of the Civil War. He admits, frankly, that in the pages which follow he has relied on such American critics as John S. Hart, Rufus W. Griswold, Edwin P. Whipple, and Henry T. Tuckerman. The organization of the material is not the usual one. No attempt is made to treat the literature by periods or to tell the story of American literature in straightforward chronological fashion; rather, the writers and books are grouped according to types. Chapter one deals with theology, journalism, and children's books; chapter two with history and biography; chapter three with essays, æsthetics, criticism, translations, philosophy, humor, and miscellaneous works; chapter four with fiction; chapter five with poetry; and chapter six with the poetical work of Bryant—the criticism here consisting largely of the translation of an essay on Bryant by Tuckerman. Most of the estimates are sensible, and quite up to the level of those by American literary historians of the day; without the use of the chronological order for the whole, practically all of the important authors and books, as well as many unimportant ones, are fitted into the classifications. The short introduction is full of pertinent observations. As early as 1866 Brunnemann was able to see the unfairness of much British criticism of American literature:

> In England war es . . . vor fünfzig Jahren allgemein Sitte, über die literarischen Ansprüche Americas verächtlich die Nase zu rümpfen. Ein solches Gebahren war aber nichts weniger als gerecht und gibt nur einen neuen Beweis für den unphilosophischen Sinn der Engländer, denn man konnte von den neuen Niederlassungen naturgemäss gar nichts Anderes erwarten, als dass sie ihre geistige Nahrung aus der Literatur des Mutterlandes ziehen würden, die ihnen durch die Gemeinsamkeit der Sprache, durch die Uebereinstimmung der Empfindungen und durch das Bewusstsein der Zusammengehörigkeit theuer war und bleiben musste.[24]

After this the critic goes on to say that naturally Colonial authors were imitative at first, and that the predilection for English char-

[23] *Geschichte der Nordamericanischen Literatur. Eine Literar-historische Studie* (Leipzig: Fried. Wilh. Grunow, 1866). [159 pp.]

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

acter and English art has to some extent remained; yet with the development of the country and the increase in means of education, American literature has taken on an original, individual character. The outlook for the future is hopefully presented in the concluding remarks at the end of the volume. The New World, Brunnemann believes, will have its Shakespeare; and who knows but that some young Goethe may be just on the point of arriving on the scene? He is not blindly optimistic in the account, however, but sees the weaknesses of American literature, in which there is often "ein bedauerlicher Mangel an Selbstbewusstsein, ein bedenkliches Festhalten an abgenutzten Mustern und mit weniger Ausnahmen eine wahrhaft obstinate Blindheit für das scenische, historische und sociale Material, wie es das eigene Land doch vielfach in so reichlichem Maase bietet."[25]

Very different from Brunnemann's little book is the voluminous *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Literatur*[26] by Karl Knortz, the indefatigable translator and student of American literature, who for some years lived and taught in the United States. This history is a comprehensive, detailed work, of more than nine hundred pages, printed in two volumes. It is largely a record of facts, dates, names, a repository of information; in the matter of organization, the work is a series of running commentaries on authors and books, with here and there a brief attempt at general discussion. The author covers a wide territory, omitting from his pages little that is either directly or indirectly connected with literary activities in this country. He appears to have set out systematically to make available for Germans all the information in Hart's *Manual of American Literature* and other such works; and in so doing he, like Hart, anticipated the editors of *The Cambridge History* in emphasizing the manifold aspects of American literary history. In his volumes one finds treatments of political speeches, the sectional differences which have affected authorship, journalistic activities, the works of scholars, the social and political background. Although it contains many inaccuracies, the work is, as far as information is concerned, about as reliable as others of the class in English; and the evaluation of men and their writings is in virtual agreement with that of critics preceding Knortz. To Poe, however, there is but scanty justice done, in the brief and inadequate criticism of eleven pages. While admitting that Poe was

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[26] *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Literatur* (Berlin: Hans Lüstenöder, 1891), 432, 491 pp. [2 vols.]

"ein seltener Originaldichter,"[27] with a classical style, the author fails to appreciate his striking melody of phrase, his importance as a critic, his position as a pioneer in the field of the short story. Bayard Taylor is allotted a whole chapter, as is likewise James Freeman Clarke; Paul Hamilton Hayne is regarded as "ein Romantiker vom reinsten Wasser";[28] and scores of negligible figures like Robert Dinsmoor, Amelia Welby, and George Lippard are admitted into the history. The superabundance of material handicapped the author, and evidently made for the most serious fault of the work: poor organization—indeed, there is almost no organization. The material appears to have been thrown together, or rather strung together, carelessly, and in the second volume, at least, with no apparent design. The reader is puzzled to understand why one chapter should be given over to W. D. Gallagher, Robert Lowell, Theodore Tilton, Will Carleton, John Burroughs, and Charles Dudley Warner; or why James T. Fields and Jones Very should come together in another; or why the chapter on recent prose contains the criticism of William Gilmore Simms; or why Francis James Child, R. G. White, H. N. Hudson, and Hiram Corson should be discussed in the chapter on the essayists and novelists instead of in the one on scholars. After completing the earlier chapters the reader finds chronological relations of authors and books, or their logical associations, but sparingly indicated.

The prime virtue of Knortz's work is that it at least suggests the amount, extent, and variety of literary activities in the United States. It points to literature as largely an outgrowth of social, political, and economic conditions, and contains, amid the somewhat confused ramblings of its pages, a number of suggestive remarks on individuals, publications, and the literary background.

Eduard Engel's *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Litteratur*[29] is a small book, again, of about the size of Brunnemann's, but it is a decided improvement over the latter. Although only an outline, it is a vigorous critical work withal, in which the author comments with pungency on men, periods, and national qualities and conditions. During its first hundred years of practical existence, he says, American literature can be said to have contributed little to world literature; yet "kommen auch hierbei die drei Namen Poe, Haw-

[27] *Ibid.*, I, 335.
[28] *Ibid.*, I, 339.
[29] *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Litteratur* (Zweite Auflage (In neuer Bearbeitung.) Leipzig: J. Baedeker, 1897). 84 pp.

thorne, Emerson in Wettbewerb mit den berühmtesten neuen Dichtern, Erzählern, Denkern."[30] The literature of North America is fundamentally of English texture, but he would not deny to it some original traits, not found in the writings of the mother country:

> Das Neue, was Amerika in die Litteratur des angelsächsischen Stammes gebracht hat, wird durch Cooper, Poe, Hawthorne, Lowell, Emerson verkörpert, deren Jeder ein Gebiet vertritt, das in England wenig, oder garnicht, oder nicht mit solcher Kunst angebaut worden.[31]

The author's judgments, whether conventional or not, are usually well founded. He feels that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* belongs more to political than to literary history; that there is more wit in *The Biglow Papers* than in *Hudibras*; that Emerson is the equal of Ruskin or Carlyle; and that although most of Bryant's poems, particularly the long ones, may not continue to be read, nevertheless "ist auch diese seine Dichtung mit nachdenklicher Naturbetrachtung von grösserem Schwunge als die seines Zeitgenossen Wordsworth, mit dem er sonst ungefähr auf gleicher Höhe steht; Bryant sieht mehr von der Natur der Erde und des Menschen, als Wordsworth, denn er sieht mit weiterem und tieferem Blick."[32] In discussing the short story he remarks that "Die Beliebtheit der *short story* bei den Amerikanern entspricht der Hast des amerikanischen Lebens."[33] Even more than in the short story, however, Engel finds in American humor a manifestation of the national temper:

> Der amerikanische Humor ist etwas so Absonderliches wie das amerikanische Klima. Er ist nicht für Jedermanns Geschmack, z. B. nicht für den deutschen, der oft Humor mit Rührseligkeit verwechselt. In Deutschland hat "Humor" noch etwas von seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung bewarht: wir verlangen, dass ein Humorist uns etwas Feuchtes ins Auge bringe. . . .
>
> Anders mit den Amerikanern: ihr Humor hat nichts Feuchtes; im Gegenteil, er ist gerade das, was man mit komischer Sprachmengerei "trockenen Humor" nennt. Er hat etwas Grotteskes in seinem Wesen; die Lust zur Übertreibung artet zuweilen in die völlige Tollheit aus. An gewissen "practical jokes" des Humors von Mark Twain und Artemus Ward würde Rabelais sein Vergnügen gehabt haben.[34]

The book ends with a brief chapter on Emerson and his circle. Engel considers Transcendentalism the finest flowering of culture

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

in the United States, and Emerson of course the chief product of the movement.

The last of the four German histories, *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Literatur*[35] by the well-known grammarian and literary historian, Leon Kellner, is the most pithy and vigorously written of them all. Here, one feels, is practically no echoing of other critics, but a first-hand examination of the field, the results reported with sprightliness and effect. In its freshness the work reminds one of John Macy's *Spirit of American Literature* or Fred Lewis Pattee's *History of American Literature since 1870,* two volumes which appeared almost at the same time with it. As in these books, so in Kellner's history the reader may come upon statements which provoke him into disagreement, and may be surprised, moreover, at omissions and choices for emphasis, but he will doubtless discover something to think over or to reconsider. For one thing, there is considerable suggestiveness in the organization of the material—in the divisions of the subject and the grouping of authors. Instead of the usual sections on "The Colonial Period," "The Revolutionary Period," "The First National Era," and the like, one finds here such chapters as "Das Gepräge der Americanischen Literatur," "Die Subjektiven," "Die Heimatkunst," "Die Psychologische Erzählung," and "Die Intellektuellen der Cambridger Universität." The men discussed in the last-named chapter were grouped together, says the author, not because they form a school, but because of certain obvious similarities in their training, heritage, and ideals.

Kellner's emphasis on particular works or situations and his independent evaluations are worth noting. He preceded Professor Pattee, for example, in insisting that the Civil War marks an important division in literary history. He contends that the dearth of true poetry in Colonial times was due not so much to lack of time and opportunity to write it on the part of the settlers as to their absorption in religion. He finds that the New England poets are at their best in singing of freedom or of equality. The proper introduction to Emerson, he contends, is *English Traits,* rather than selected essays or the poems. He dares make the statement that Holmes "ist unter den Schriftstellern aller Zeiten und Völker eine einzige, unver-

[35] *Geschichte der Nordamerikanischen Litteratur* (Berlin und Leipzig: G. J. Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung, 1913), 116, 94 pp. [2 vols.]

An English translation of this work by Julia Franklin was published in 1915 by Doubleday, Page and Company, Garden City, N. Y.

gleichliche Erscheinung,"[36] and adds further that "Holmes ist in erster Reihe Psycholog; und da ist er jedenfalls der Vorläufer, vielleicht auch der Lehrer der Deutschen in einem sehr wesentlichen Kapitel der Psychologie gewesen."[37] In interpreting the fiction of men like Joel Chandler Harris and James Lane Allen, he offers the opinion: "Die stärkste Seite der amerikanischen Heimatkünstler ist —im Gegensatz zu den kosmopolitischen grossen Erzählern Amerikas wie Howells und James—ihr enger Horizont, ihre Einfalt, ihr ganz kindliches, ungebrochenes Wesen; das gibt ihnen eine Geistesverwandtschaft mit den naiven Dichtern der antiken Welt."[38] And quite in opposition to the usual view, he holds that Puritanism has given, instead of weakness, strength to the books of Americans.

Throughout the discussion are passages reminding the reader that the critic is a foreigner, consciously estimating the accomplishments of a people and land not his own. For those who wish to view American literature through the eyes of a European at once sympathetic, intelligent, learned, and one who knows a considerable part of it at first hand, Kellner's work has more worth perhaps than any other German survey of the subject.

[36] *Ibid.*, I, 100.
[37] *Ibid.*, I, 104.
[38] *Ibid.*, II, 55.

REITERATIVE DEVICES IN *LEAVES OF GRASS*

AUTREY NELL WILEY
College of Industrial Arts, Texas State College for Women

MR. JOHN ERSKINE, in a very interesting article published in *Studies in Philology*[1] several years ago, has drawn attention to the extraordinary rarity of run-on lines in *Leaves of Grass*.[2] This fondness for the end-pause, Mr. Erskine considers rightly one of the distinctive features of Whitman's verse. But another noteworthy distinction of Whitman's prosody, which has to do likewise with poetic form, but to which, I believe, attention has not heretofore been called, is the frequency with which Whitman employs epanaphora and epanalepsis—two rhetorical devices, which have entered so extensively into the form of *Leaves of Grass* as to become virtual prosodic chains.

Epanaphora, or initial repetition, appears in some form in 262 of the 403 poems that make up the latest edition of *Leaves of Grass*.[3] It gives pattern, by my count, to no fewer than four thousand of the upward of 10,500 lines, and I believe it plays a very considerable part in the rhythmical effects of Whitman's poems. A familiar example may be cited from the opening lines of "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking":

> *Out of the* cradle endlessly rocking,
> *Out of the* mocking-bird's throat, the
> musical shuttle,
> *Out of the* Ninth-month midnight.

But the poems in which this device is employed on the largest scale are "Salut au Monde!", "Song of the Broad-Axe," "Reversals," "Transpositions," "Excelsior," "Song of the Answerer," "Song of Myself," and "Our Old Feuillage." It appears most frequently in a sequence of two or three or four lines. But it involves a five-line sequence a total of fifty-five times; a six-line sequence twenty-eight times; a seven-line sequence twenty-six times; an eight-line sequence seven times; a nine-line sequence nine times; a ten-line sequence five

[1] XX (1923), 336-344.

[2] In more than 10,500 lines in *Leaves of Grass*, there are, by my count, only twenty run-on lines.

[3] *Leaves of Grass*, edited by Emory Holloway (1927).

times; an eleven-line sequence nine times; a twelve-line sequence five times; a thirteen-line sequence four times; a fourteen-line sequence three times; a fifteen-line sequence three times; a seventeen-line sequence twice; an eighteen-line sequence once; and single clusters of lines running, respectively to twenty lines, twenty-one lines, twenty-three lines, twenty-four lines, twenty-six lines, twenty-seven lines, and thirty-four lines. Some short poems exhibit epanaphora throughout. In "Reversals" and "Transpositions," for instance, every line begins with the word *Let*. In "Excelsior" ten lines out of twelve begin with *And who*. "Salut au Monde!" has epanaphora in 191 lines out of 227. A summary of the initial words in this poem, with numerals in parentheses to indicate the number of times each word or group of words occurs in sequence, gives some idea of Whitman's fearless use of this device:

O (1), Such (2), Each (1), What (3), Who are the (3), What (3), Within (1), Asia (1), Banding (1), Curiously (1), Within (1), Stretch'd (1), Within (1), Malaysia (1), What do you (1), I hear (7), I hear the (11), What do you (1), Who (1), I see (15), The (5), I behold (1), Some (1), I behold (1), Some (1), Others (9), Wait at (2), I see (23), This (1), I return (1), I see (15), And see (1), I see (11), I am (5), I (2), I see (10), I look (1), I see (1), I look (1), I see (3), The (3), I see (5), And I (1), You (27), All you (2), And you (2), Health (1), Each of us (4), You (10), I do not (2), You (1), My (1), I (2), You (1), I (1), You (1), I have (2), Salut (1), What (1), All (1), Toward (1), (1), To (1), For (1).

There are, in reality, some fifty poems in which more than forty per cent of the lines are introduced by epanaphora. Among these fifty poems are "Song of the Broad-Axe," with initial repetition in 169 lines out of 253, or sixty-six per cent of its lines; "Song of the Answerer," with initial repetition in forty-one lines out of eighty-three, or forty-seven per cent of its lines; and "Our Old Feuillage," with initial repetition in thirty-seven lines out of eighty-two, or forty-five per cent of its lines.

Noteworthy likewise is the number of words involved in the initial reiterative patterns; for Whitman, though repeating extensively the unit of one word or two or three words, employs also units consisting of four, five, and even eight words. The familiar style of the poets who, like Greene, are charged with having "bodged up" their blank verse with *and's* and *if's* does not appear preeminently in *Leaves of Grass*. On the contrary, Whitman employs most

extensively the pronoun *I*, which he repeats at the beginning of thirty-four successive lines in "Salut au Monde!"; the verb *Let*, which introduces thirty-three successive lines in "Respondez!"; and the pronoun *You*, which is repeated at the beginning of twenty-seven successive lines in "Salut au Monde!" The most extensive repetition of the unit of two words occurs in the employment of *I see* in "Salut au Monde!" at the beginning of twenty-three successive lines, but other striking instances of similar patterns may be seen in the use of *I hear* in eleven lines in "Salut au Monde!" and *I announce* in eight lines in "So Long!" interrupted by one line off pattern and resumed in six lines. The unit of three words may be noted in "Salut au Monde!", in which eleven lines begin with *I hear the*, and clusters of six and seven lines begin with *I see the*. The unit of four words, *I do not doubt*, introduces seven lines in "Assurances"; and a similar unit, *Welcome are lands of*, introduces five lines in "Song of the Broad-Axe." Of less frequent and less extensive occurrence is the unit of five words, as illustrated by *Nor the place of the*, introducing three lines, and *Where the city of the*, introducing four lines, in "Song of the Broad-Axe." The unit of eight words occurs in "I Sing the Body Electric" and "By Blue Ontario's Shore," which contains two lines marked by both epanaphora and terminal repetition:

> *I will see if I am not as* majestic *as they,*
> *I will see if I am not as* subtle and real *as they.*

Tennyson, who was also making use of the reiterative device in Whitman's day, seems to have held his patterns within the bounds of four and five lines.[4] Approaching Whitman only in the number of words that he included in the reiterative unit, he introduced three consecutive lines with the unit of seven words. One distinctive feature of Whitman's verse derives, therefore, not only from the number of words involved in the unit that is repeated, but—and, in this respect, chiefly—from the number of lines in which this unit occurs initially.

Epanaphora, giving pattern thus extensively to Whitman's lines in *Leaves of Grass*, serves various artistic purposes, appearing in introductions and conclusions, unifying lines within a verse-paragraph, and linking verse-paragraphs that require transitions. There is, indeed, much to be said of the architectural significance of epana-

[4] See Émile Lauvrière, *Repetition and Parallelism in Tennyson* (London, 1910), pp. 30-34.

phora, serving as a firm regulator of poetic form, increasing the possibilities of rhetorical emphasis, and lending admirable symmetry to such brief lyrics as "For you O Democracy":

> Come, I will make the continent indissoluble,
> *I will make* the most splendid race the sun ever
> shone upon,
> *I will make* divine magnetic lands,
> *With the love of comrades,*
> *With the* life-long *love of comrades.*
>
> *I will* plant companionship thick as trees along
> all the rivers of America, and along the shores
> of the great lakes, and all over the prairies,
> *I will make* inseparable cities with their arms
> about each other's necks,
> *By the love of comrades,*
> *By the* manly *love of comrades.*
>
> *For you* these from me, O Democracy, to serve
> you ma femme!
> *For you, for you* I am thrilling these songs.

But scarcely less striking—and hardly less significant for his art—is Whitman's employment of epanalepsis, or repetition within the line, as in "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking":

> *Loud! loud! loud!*
> *Loud I* call to *you, my love!*
> High and clear *I* shoot my voice over the waves
> Surely *you must know who is here, is here,*
> *You must know who I* am, *my love.*

and in "Tears":

> *Tears! tears! tears!*
> *In* the night, *in* solitude, *tears,*
> On the white shore *dripping, dripping,*
> suck'd in by the sand,
> *Tears,* not a star shining, all dark and
> desolate,
> Moist *tears* from the eyes of a muffled
> head;
> O who is *that* ghost? *that* form in the
> dark, with *tears*?

In 4,397 lines, or forty-one per cent of the more than 10,500 lines in *Leaves of Grass,* epanalepsis appears. In two hundred instances the internal repetition is immediate; no word intervenes between the second or third or fourth or fifth occurrence of a word or group of words within a single line. The most frequent pattern among these two hundred examples appears in the use of one word or phrase twice:

1. Initially, for example, in "To the Man-of-War-Bird":
   "*What joys, what joys* were thine!"
2. Medially, for example, in "Song of the Exposition":
   "Echoed through *long, long* centuries to come."
3. Terminally, for example, in "Song of the Banner at Daybreak":
   "Come up here, *bard, bard.*"

Another striking feature and not infrequent pattern may be seen in the lines in which a word is used three times, as for instance:

"*Hungering, hungering, hungering,* for primal energies and Nature's dauntlessness."

—"Rise O Days."

"May-be at many and many-a-more removes—yet *Allah, Allah, Allah* is there."

—"A Persian Lesson."

"But I am that which unseen comes and *sings, sings, sings.*"

—"Song of the Banner at Daybreak."

Less numerous examples may be cited for the use of a word four times, as initially in "Song of the Banner at Daybreak":

Flapping, flapping, flapping, flapping, by
sounds, by voices clearer,

and terminally in "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking":

And again *death, death, death, death.*

In some few instances, Whitman has repeated a word five times, as in "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking":

Loved! loved! loved! loved! loved!

Another pattern occasionally used is that of two different words in double repetition:

"And over all *the sky—the sky! far, far* out of reach, studded, breaking out, the eternal stars."

—"Bivouac on a Mountain Side."

Serving, of course, to express varied thoughts and feelings throughout *Leaves of Grass,* immediate, or successive, epanalepsis comes best to the poet's hand in rapturous lines of hope, in verses of ecstatic love, and in such sobbing lyric phrases as occur in "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking." More frequent, however, than successive repetion is interrupted repetition within a single line. In numerous instances only one word intervenes between the repeated units, though more commonly several words occur between the units of the reiterative pattern. As among the examples of immediate epanalepsis, so again among the instances of interrupted epanalepsis, the doubles and the trebles appear:

"*War,* red *war* is my song through your streets, O city!"
—"City of Ships."

"*Long* I was hugg'd close—*long* and *long.*"
—"Song of Myself."

"Old age land-lock'd within its winter bay—(*cold, cold,* O *cold!*)."
—"Of That Blithe Throat of Thine."

The cognate object likewise enters in:

"Have none *chanted* for thee a *chant* of fullest welcome?"
—"When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd."

But the most numerous patterns are of the three following types:

1. Initial to medial, as in "Song of Myself":
   "*Nor the cause of the friendship I* emit, *nor the cause of the friendship I* take again."
2. Medial, as in "The Wound-Dresser":
   ". . . I dwell not on *soldiers'* perils or *soldiers'* joys."
3. Medial to final, as in "Virginia—the West":
   "Memories of old *in abeyance,* love and faith *in abeyance.*"

But epanalepsis with Whitman is not limited to the single line. Still holding to the form of successive repetition, in numerous instances, it flows into a second verse, taking, for example, the following pattern:

"*Blow! blow! blow!*
Blow up sea-winds along Paumanok's shore."
—"Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking."

As a matter of fact, this return in a second line to the final word of an immediately preceding line is an important poetic device in

Leaves of Grass. It serves frequently and fittingly as a transitional link. Such, for instance, is the use that Whitman makes of this special type of epanalepsis in several parts of "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd":

I

. . . . . .

I mourn'd, and yet shall mourn with *ever-returning spring*.
Ever-returning spring, trinity sure to me you bring,

. . . . . .

IV

. . . . . .

Sings by himself a *song*.
Song of the bleeding throat,

. . . . . .

V

. . . . . .

Night and day journeys a *coffin*.

VI

Coffin that passes through lanes and streets.

Epanalepsis enters, not infrequently, into the texture of an entire poem, having much to do with unity, symmetry, and variety. Sometimes fifty per cent of the words in a passage—lyric passages, especially—are given over to this device. In the following stanzas of forty-nine words, for instance, twenty-seven words are parts of the reiterative pattern:

Shine! shine! shine!
Pour down your warmth, great sun!
While we bask, *we two together*,

Two together!
Winds blow south, *or winds blow* north,
Day *come* white, *or* night *come* black,
Home, or rivers and mountains from *home*,
Singing all *time*, minding no *time*,
While we two keep *together*.

An especially striking use of epanalepsis occurs in "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd." Sustaining a *leitmotif* of sorrow,

Whitman repeats at irregular intervals certain thematic words and phrases: *heart-shaped leaves of rich green, death, star, lilacs,* and *him I love.* This more extensive use of epanalepsis, as it pertains to some one particular word that constitutes the *leitmotif,* may be noted also in "Vigil Strange I Kept on the Field One Night," in which the word *vigil* occurs twelve times; "Tears," in which the word *tears* occurs twelve times; and "City of Ships," which is threaded by the word *city,* occurring twelve times, and the word *ships,* appearing five times. It may be noted, in this connection, that the monotonous and mechanical effect which results from a prolonged reiterative pattern in poetry of conventional line-lengths came not so swiftly in Whitman's best verse because of the variety in the syllabic length of the lines.[5] Prolonging or reducing the time-interval, as his judgment dictated, Whitman achieved sometimes the æsthetic delight which is dependent upon a return that surprises, though it is anticipated. In "City of Ships," for example, the varied repetition of two words of the title gives the following pattern:

City of *Ships*!
(O the black *ships*! O the fierce *ships*!
O the beautiful sharp-bow'd steam-*ships* and
sail-*ships*!)
City of the world! (for all races are here,
All the lands of the earth make contributions
here;)
City of the sea! *city* of hurried and glitter-
ing tides!
City whose gleeful tides continually rush or
recede, whirling in and out with eddies
and foam!
City of wharves and stores—city of tall
façades of marble and iron!
Proud and passionate *city*—mettlesome,
mad, extravagant *city*!
Spring up O *city*—not for peace alone, but
be indeed yourself, warlike!
Fear not—submit to no models but your own
O *city*!

As a part of epanalepsis, and sometimes a counterpart to epanaphora, another reiterative device occurs; namely, the final repetition of the last word in a line, as in "Song of Myself":

[5] With the exception of the line of one syllable in "States," the syllabic length of Whitman's lines ranges, by count, from three syllables to sixty-nine syllables.

Root of wash'd sweet-flag! timorous pond-
snipe! nest of guarded duplicate eggs!
it shall be you!
Mix'd tussled hay of head, beard, brawn,
it shall be you!
Trickling sap of maple, fibre of manly wheat,
it shall be you!
Sun so generous *it shall be you*!
Vapors lighting and shading my face *it shall*
be you!
You sweaty brooks and dews *it shall be you*!
Winds whose soft-tickling genitals rub against
me *it shall be you*!
Broad muscular fields, branches of live oak,
loving lounger in my winding paths, *it*
shall be you!
Hands I have taken, face I have kiss'd, mortal
I have touch'd, *it shall be you.*

In 634 lines, or six per cent of the lines in *Leaves of Grass,* a word, or a phrase, receives terminal repetition, though most frequently twice, sometimes three, four, five, six, and nine times.[6] In addition to the nine lines cited from "Song of Myself," two other striking examples of terminal repetition may be noted in "By Blue Ontario's Shore," with nine lines ending in the phrase *you and me*, and in "Song of the Rolling Earth," with five lines ending in *and comes back most to him.* Lines that contain terminal repetition as well as epanaphora may be illustrated by the following passage from "By Blue Ontario's Shore":

I will know *if I am to be less than they,*
I will see if I am not as majestic *as they,*
I will see if I am not as subtle and real *as they,*
I will see if I am to be less generous *than they.*

It is of interest to find Whitman thus giving emphasis to the end of the line. As contributory to prosodic form, these 634 verses with terminal repetition deserve more than passing consideration.

In his early uncollected poems the situation is strikingly different. Here Whitman introduced sparingly any certain form of repetition. Only seven per cent of these lines show epanaphora; *Leaves of Grass*, on the other hand, shows thirty-seven per cent. With one

[6] The number of lines marked by terminal repetition and the frequency of each cluster are as follows: 2 ll., 223; 3 ll., 28; 4 ll., 12; 5 ll., 4; 6 ll., 3; and 9 ll., 2.

exception,[7] initial repetition among the early attempts does not extend beyond two or three lines. By way of contrast, it may be noted that in "Salut au Monde!" twenty-seven and thirty-four consecutive lines are marked by epanaphora. Epanalepsis appears in only ten per cent of the lines that were published before 1855, while it appears in no less than forty-one per cent of the lines in *Leaves of Grass*. Successive repetition, occurring at least two hundred times in *Leaves of Grass*, appears only three times in the poems that were published before 1855. Whitman's use of the reiterative devices shows a constant increase from 1855 to 1881. From a frequency of approximately twenty-two per cent in 1860, the use of the repetitive patterns increases to thirty-two per cent in 1867 and 1871 and thirty-eight per cent in 1881.[8] From such observations comes the conclusion that these two long-tried conventions, epanaphora and epanalepsis, which Whitman had regarded in his early poems as less essential than rime, became, after 1855, when he had virtually abandoned rime, two essentially important rhetorical devices in his poetry.

Of signal importance to rhetorical emphasis and prosodic form, epanaphora and epanalepsis are primarily the devices of a lyrist. No small part of the lyric quality of the songs and chants that make up *Leaves of Grass* derives from the extensive use of these various reiterative devices. Giving new and remarkable turns to the long-favored repetend-patterns and doubtless evolving some patterns of his own, Whitman discovered an effective sort of lyric emphasis in a lyricism of exceedingly broad circles.

[7] "Resurgemus" contains four lines that begin with *They*.

[8] After 1881, the devices occur less frequently. It should be noted that Whitman employed epanaphora and epanalepsis most frequently when he wrote his long poems. In his later poems, which are, for the most part, poems of seldom more than ten lines, Whitman used the reiterative devices with a frequency of approximately twenty-two per cent.

WHITMAN AND DOWDEN

HAROLD BLODGETT
Cornell University

DO YOU know Walt Whitman? If not you must. I have just got his 'Leaves of Grass' and am likely some time to have a short (eight or ten pp.) paper in *Macmillan* on 'The Poetry of Democracy—Walt Whitman'."[1] So, writing to his brother John on September 14, 1869, Dowden announced his discovery of the new American poet and his intention to write about him immediately. But trouble was ahead. The *Macmillan Magazine* refused Whitman summarily, although the editor, George Grove, was favorably disposed toward Dowden. Then when the article was accepted and set up in type for the *Contemporary Review,* Strahan, the proprietor, and Dean Alford decided, just before it was to appear, that it was much too dangerous for their clerical clientèle. Dean Alford took the pains to write to Dowden "in a contemptuous way of Whitman's work as a poet," although Strahan later referred to Walt as "one of the truest poets of our day."[2] Finally Dowden sent the article as a gift to the *Westminster Review,* in which it appeared, July, 1871.

Two years before Dowden discovered Whitman, he had been appointed Professor of English Literature and Oratory in the University of Dublin. Then only twenty-four years old, he had already achieved quite unprecedented academic honors. At the age of twelve he had written a series of essays, and from that time on the routine of his life was literary and his adventures were among manuscripts. For a young man of such antecedents to embarrass English editors by seriously approving Walt Whitman at this early date would be, we may infer, little short of shocking to the conventional mind, which was only too glad to accept Whitman at his own valuation as "one of the roughs." Even Whitman confessed surprise in his old age that the scholars—"men like Dowden, Rossetti, Symonds"—should have liked him. "They almost upset my applecart," he confided to Traubel.[3] But we know that Whitman's humorous dismay was partly disingenuous, for none knew better than he that his cause

[1] *Edward Dowden's Letters,* p. 40.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 64. Dowden sums up the history of the article in a letter written to Charles N. Elliot. See Elliot's *Walt Whitman, as Man, Poet, and Friend,* p. 80.

[3] Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden,* III, 219. For succeeding references to this work, I shall use simply the name Traubel.

was mainly supported by bookmen whose enthusiasm was nourished by the very over-civilization with which they felt themselves, through long association with print, to be tainted.

Nevertheless Dowden's warm interest in Whitman at this point in his own career—when he had but recently assumed a distinguished post and was cherishing, we may be sure, the ambition to establish a reputation for sound judgment—was exceptional among university men, who as a rule are extremely cautious in admitting new claims. The secret of his appreciation of Whitman is, of course, a matter of temperament, but two of his characteristics may briefly be noted here as being especially influential in attracting him to the American bard. The first is the fortified idealism with which Dowden, in common with the spirit of the Victorian age, approached all of his literary problems. The attitude is directly explicit in every criticism he made, and it finds its best expression in his idea that literature is part of "a gradually opening revelation or creation from man's spirit, not to be comprehended all in a moment."[4] Among the scores of references to Whitman in his essays and personal letters, he rarely fails to emphasize the "saving and delivering" power of the poet.[5] To Dowden, as to so many other European admirers, Whitman brought a gospel which in the nineteenth century possessed a healing power. The American's expansive optimism, grounded in an unparalleled democratic faith, was heartening to scholars who felt about them the shock of falling dogmas. They found it necessary to identify evolution with progress, to reassure themselves of the indestructibility of the soul, to affirm the harmony of religion with science, and of science with poetry. In Whitman they found an answerer. In his attitude toward Whitman's poetry, Dowden belonged to the tradition of Tennyson's *In Memoriam.* Although Thomas Hardy had already in that day written some poetry that must have been nourished upon Ecclesiastes; not yet, to use the words of Marcel Proust, had the dark and fatal wind of disenchantment blown the icons from the altars.

A second characteristic in Dowden which drew him toward Whitman was the zest with which he exercised his keen faculty for comprehending the central or structural idea behind a new work. Herein we may understand a special fascination that the *Leaves of*

[4] *Transcripts and Studies,* p. 240.

[5] See, for example, Dowden's letter to Whitman of March 16, 1876, Traubel, I, 122; his letter of October 4, 1876, Traubel, II, 90; and *Shakespeare, His Mind and Art,* pp. 35 and 381.

Grass must have held for his temperament. He liked hard tasks of analysis. As a young man he had astonished Browning by producing a coherent interpretation of the celebrated *Sordello*. When he came upon *Leaves of Grass*, he must have felt like an explorer at the border of a mysterious forest. In this chaos that had dismayed the cautious, he sought a principle, and we find him writing on October 27, 1869, to Elizabeth West:

> As to Walt Whitman I am naturally much interested, having a short paper on him in the hands of Edr. of *Macmillan*. My paper is quite a partial view—considers him only as the poet of democracy and tries to make as much out of the principle of equality for him, as I made for Tennyson out of "Law" and for Browning out of "Impulse," in the Afternoon Lectures. I give no record of the peculiar pleasures or dissatisfactions which his poetry gives one—so the article is rather wooden and dry.[6]

When we read Dowden's essay now, it is hard to understand why a discussion so frankly fair and moderate should have excited editorial alarm. Among early utterances on Whitman's claims it is conspicuous for its sobriety. It opens by noting the lack in America of a genuine native literature before the advent of Whitman, who is "announced with a flourish of critical trumpets as Bard of America and Bard of democracy." Dowden does not stress the fact that so far Whitman had himself been the chief trumpet-blower, but accepts the poet's assertion and sets out to justify it. His justification takes the form of an analysis of democratic art through the reverse process of analyzing aristocratic art. Noting of the latter that it strives after selectness and exclusiveness, that it takes little interest in the future, that it shrinks from innovation, and that it enjoys refined gratifications and a superior point of view, Dowden admirably sums up all that Whitman is not. Democratic art, Dowden goes on to say, acknowledges no agreed canons of composition, no critical dictators, no withdrawals, but is constantly making experiments. When he turns to Whitman, he "perceives at once that this work corresponds with this state of things." While such a classification, like all strict literary classifications, is a little too neat and dogmatic, we cannot deny that it is generally authentic and useful. Not content to illus-

[6] *Fragments from Old Letters*, I, 5. Dowden's conscientiously analytical point of view in criticizing Whitman sometimes irked the poet, who loved better the attitude of affection. Once he complained that even "the noble, good Dowden . . . is touched . . . with the frost of the literary clique", and he spoke of the "restraint" of Dowden's article. See Traubel, I, 135 and II, 204.

trate it in his poetry, Whitman explained it in his prose, but Dowden brought it down to simple terms.

When he turns directly to the *Leaves of Grass,* Dowden picks his way cautiously but with serene confidence in his poet. He accepts Whitman's defense of his own technique and quotes approvingly the magnificent passage from the 1855 preface in which Whitman explains his conception of form. He explains Whitman's habit of cataloguing by that spirit of large acceptance whose exercise delights Whitman if not the reader. He accepts the glorification of democracy in the conviction that the poet's enthusiasm is not mere "Schwarmerei" but grounded in realistic observation. When he comes to the "Children of Adam," he halts to make an admission that is a marvel of tactful reservation and probably the gentlest rebuke ever administered in critical literature. In the Manual of Polite Criticism it deserves first place. He says, "If there be any class of subjects which it is more truly natural, more truly human *not* to speak of than to speak of (such speech producing self-consciousness, whereas part of our nature, it may be maintained, is healthy only while it lives and moves in holy blindness and unconsciousness of self), if there be any sphere of silence, then Whitman has been guilty of invading that sphere of silence." With this reservation, Dowden is ready to agree with Anne Gilchrist that Whitman does not give the body authority over the soul. He is much attracted by the "Calamus" poems, whose spirit he interprets as simple comradeship actuated by no such troublesome motive as that which worried Symonds. Concluding with a discussion of Whitman's moral and religious principles, Dowden remarks that the poet's habit of estimating the worth of any man by the worth of his body and soul is just and moral, though revolutionary.

In his study Dowden deliberately avoided the question, "Is Whitman a poet at all?" on the ground that it was not profitable, but we may infer that from the strictly artistic point of view he would make many reservations about the *Leaves.* We wish that elsewhere he might have given us his record of the "peculiar pleasures or dissatisfactions" that he felt in Whitman. It is possible that we might have a clue to his artistic judgment of *Leaves of Grass* in the recent study of Whitman by John Bailey, who estimates his poetical stature by traditional standards. Bailey is worried about Whitman's irregular lines and finds the comparatively regular "O Pioneers" more to his taste than many other poems whose music is

lawless and free. Of this study, Elizabeth Dowden said in a recent letter, "I think my husband would have quite endorsed the view of Whitman set forth in it."

Although Dowden's article was by no means the first important European comment upon *Leaves of Grass*,[7] it was signally effective in strengthening Whitman's position. By 1871 Dowden had made a certain name for himself as a scholar of standing, and consequently his endorsement of Whitman carried weight among people inclined to rely on judgment from high places. Whitman was of course well aware of the peculiar value of Dowden's support and took a special delight in saying: "Dowden is a confirmed scholar—the people who call my friends ignoramuses, unscholarly, off the streets, cannot quarrel with the equipment of Dowden. Dowden has all the points they insist upon—yet he can tolerate Walt Whitman."[8]

Walt, however, was a sore trial to conscientious critics; powerfully drawn or repelled, they would write and then misgive. Dowden was, despite his accent of confidence, no exception. At first he was afraid that he had been too cool, and later that he had been too hasty. He wrote to Whitman:

> I ought to say that the article expresses very partially the impression which your writings have made on me. It keeps, as is obvious, at a single point of view and regards only what becomes more visible from that point. But also I wrote more coolly than I feel because I wanted those, who being ignorant of your writings are perhaps prejudiced against them, to say: "Here is a cool judicious impartial critic who finds a great deal in Whitman—perhaps after all we are mistaken."[9]

Writing at about the same time to John Burroughs in acknowledgment of the book *Notes on Walt Whitman* (not until long afterward it was known that Whitman himself wrote a good part of this book and collaborated in the rest), Dowden confessed:

> One good effect it has had is that it has made me feel more strongly—what, indeed, I felt from the first—that such an official, inhuman way of looking at Whitman as that of my Westminster article, however true and up to a certain point valuable, is little fruitful compared with the more

[7] Some notable articles that preceded Dowden's in Europe were Lord Strangford's, *Pall Mall Gazette*, February, 1866; Moncure Conway's, *Fornightly Review*, October, 1866; and W. M. Rossetti's, *Chronicle*, July, 1867. In addition several long reviews of Rossetti's 1868 selection from Whitman appeared. Dowden's own study was reprinted with a few minor changes in his *Studies in Literature* (1878).

[8] *Traubel*, I, 224.

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 134.

personal relation which your book originates from. The vital nourishing contact with a great man is with his personality, not with the man "attenuated to an aspect" (J. H. Newman's phrase). And some such attenuation was inevitable in a study from the point of view chosen by me.[10]

From these expressions it is plain that if Dowden had chosen at this time to write the criticism of love, as he termed it, instead of judicial criticism, he would have been capable of such an affirmation as would have pleased Whitman even in his most exacting moments. We may consider it just as well, looking back upon Whitman literature, that Dowden did not at this juncture employ the language of devotion. Whitman, who liked the essay well despite his later occasional grumbling about Dowden's reserve, wrote, "I entirely accept it all & several, and am not unaware that it affords perhaps, if not the only, at least the most likely gate, by which you, as an earnest friend of my book, & believer in it, and critic of it, would gain entrance to a leading review."[11]

Yet Dowden was not sure. In a letter written to J. A. Noble on May 18, 1878, he said, "I didn't take Walt rightly in my essay. If writing it now I'd dwell on the common elements in him, Emerson and Thoreau, the three Americans of special type."[12] Another striking reference, written forty years after the publication of his article and contrasting strongly with his youthful fear that he had been too cool, is that contained in a letter to Professor Stockley on March 25, 1910:

> I feel as you do the discouragement of the hasty and erroneous verdicts on literature I often read. But it is partly because my youth is so remote, and I know I often erred myself on the way to something a little nearer the truth. My chief error I think was in too ready submission to an author whom I was right in admiring with qualifications—and now the qualifications force themselves on me. I should like, for instance, now to set forth my reservations as to Goethe, Walt Whitman, George Eliot, and others. My sympathies were too facile, though in large measure, I think, right. Leslie Stephen was free from this defect and could douche his admirations with cold water.[13]

That Dowden never formally set forth his reservations about Whitman is to be regretted, for so much of the criticism coming

[10] *Edward Dowden's Letters*, p. 56.
[11] *In Re Walt Whitman*, p. 200.
[12] *Edward Dowden's Letters*, p. 128.
[13] *Edward Dowden's Letters*, p. 364.

from the poet's friends is so rhapsodic and tedious that at a first view *Leaves of Grass* suffers discredit therefrom. Dowden probably felt this situation when he declared in 1907, "I confess that some of his American admirers would rather enfeeble than reinforce my loyalty to Walt if I allowed them. When I turn to himself I find my loyalty undiminished."[14]

Since the *Westminster* article remains the single formal criticism of Whitman that Dowden published, we may find a special interest in the frequent references in his letters, little casual comments that reveal clearly how he placed the American among his other literary pleasures. He was fond, for instance, of comparing Whitman with Victor Hugo and William Wordsworth. Once he wrote to Walt:

> There is much in common between Victor Hugo and you, but if I had to choose between *Leaves of Grass* and *La Légende des Siècles* I should not have a moment's hesitation in throwing away *La Légende.* There is a certain air of self-conscious beauty or sublimity in the attitudes which Victor Hugo's soul assumes that greatly impairs their effect with me.[15]

To John Burroughs, continuing the comparison, he wrote:

> Victor Hugo has not the massive sobriety and good sense which enables one to trust oneself to Shakespeare or to Whitman.[16]

In a later Burroughs letter Dowden suggests a comparison between Wordsworth and Whitman on the ground of their common feeling for nature, adding that had Wordsworth lived, "I do not doubt he would be a glad accepter of Whitman's poetry—I mean the *young* Wordsworth, and even, I think, Wordsworth as an old man could not have failed to admit Whitman's beauty and power, though he would have probably added qualifying sentences."[17] Again he associated the three poets together in a comment to Elizabeth West:

> Wordsworth, Whitman, and Hugo find themselves disoriented, put out of their bearings, if they pursue truth in an analytic way, through single faculties, especially the logical faculty. Their whole nature, turned now in this direction, now in that, brings in reports of the universe. I approve their practice . . . and I would give a general trust to results attained by such processes.[18]

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 353.
[15] *Traubel*, I, 442.
[16] *Ibid.*, III, 216.
[17] *Edward Dowden's Letters*, p. 57.
[18] *Fragments from Old Letters*, I, 54.

His other references, just as interesting, occur too frequently for quotation here. Other comparisons of Whitman were made—with Thoreau and Tennyson, for example—and always to Whitman's advantage. The poet's own literary judgments of such writers as Burns and Poe were quoted by Dowden with enthusiasm. Most of all he was struck by Whitman's personality, "to me very strong and enduringly attractive." At the end of an early letter he had written to Whitman:

> One thing strikes me about every one who cares for what you write—while your attraction is most absolute and the impression you make as powerful as that of any teacher or vates, you do not rob the mind of its independence, or divert it from its true direction. You make no slaves, however many lovers.[19]

And Whitman commented on this passage:

> If I wished to put a final signature upon the Leaves, a sort of consummating entablature, some phrase to round its story—give it the seal, sanction of my motive—I would use that epigram of Dowden: "To make no slaves however many lovers."[20]

Aside from advancing Whitman's cause in his letters to his friends, Dowden was always ready to turn his pen to any editorial task that might aid his American friend. He reviewed *Specimen Days and Collect* in the *Academy* for November 18, 1882, quoting delightedly from Whitman's descriptive passages and outlining the contents of the volume with something of Whitman's own gusto. At the end of his review he renewed his oft-repeated invitation that Whitman should try a voyage across the Atlantic, where, he urged, the American would be greeted by Tennyson, Ruskin, Rossetti, Symonds, Swinburne, W. Bell Scott, R. Hengist Horne, Robert Buchanan, R. L. Stevenson, and Roden Noel. Again in the *Academy* for September 8, 1883, Dowden reviewed at length the American edition of Dr. Bucke's *Life of Walt Whitman*. He could not quite swallow Bucke's incontinent enthusiasm for his master, declaring that when Bucke calls the "Song of Myself" the most important poem thus far written at any time, in any language, "we know that it is the lover who writes and not the critic." "And yet the world needs its lovers . . . ," Dowden confessed. In concluding his review, Dowden expressed his regret that Bucke with his other testimonials could not have included those of Ruskin, George Eliot, Viscount

[19] *Traubel*, I, 225. [20] *Ibid.*, I, 224.

Strangford, and Professor Clifford. It was to the English edition of Bucke's biography that Dowden arranged and edited an appendix, "English critics on Walt Whitman."

It is only when we turn to the letters exchanged between Whitman and Dowden that we clearly understand the strong personal relation in which the Irish scholar and American bard stood to each other. Dowden's correspondence is the most charming of his writing, and it is greatly to be regretted that Horace Traubel did not sanction the publication of the Whitman correspondence in the volume of Dowden's letters which appeared in 1916. Fortunately twelve of these letters, as well as two from Whitman to Dowden, are easily accessible in Traubel's huge and well-indexed chronicle, and they probably constitute a fairly complete record of the correspondence. Whitman's over-sea friends were in the habit of writing to him quite frequently of his progress abroad without expecting that Walt would reply with regularity. A few brief passages from the letters, quoted here, will be sufficient to show how effectively Dowden acted as Whitman's chief *liaison* officer in Ireland by lecturing about the poet, taking part in discussion groups, introducing the *Leaves* to his friends, collecting subscriptions for financial aid, and sending good cheer to the lonely house in Camden. In Dublin Dowden played much the same rôle for Whitman that W. M. Rossetti played in London.

Dowden's earlier letters are full of the news of Whitman's friendships ("adhesions" the poet called them) abroad. In his first letter of July 23, 1871, he said, "You have many readers in Ireland . . . none of us question that yours is the clearest, and sweetest, and fullest American voice." He also mentioned that R. Y. Tyrrell, then Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin, had given a lecture on *Leaves of Grass*. "A man who knows Greek poetry very well," he said, "and finds that it does not interfere with his regard for yours."[21] In his next letter, September 5, Dowden continued the story:

I will name some of your friends on this side of the water whom I know myself. . . . There is a clergyman, who finds his truth halved between John H. Newman and you. There is a doctor—a man of science, and a mystic—a Quaker, he has had a wish to write on the subject of your poems, and may perhaps accomplish it. There is a barrister (an ardent nature, much interested in social and political principles), he over-

[20] *Edward Dowden's Letters*, p. 128.
[21] *Traubel*, I, 134-5.

flows with two authors, Carlyle and yourself. There is a clergyman (the most sterling piece of manhood I know) he has I daresay taken you in more thoroughly than any of us, in proportion to his own soundness and integrity of nature. There is an excellent Greek scholar. There is a woman of most fine character and powerful intellect. . . . Then I know three painters in London, all men of decided genius, who care very much for all you do (one of them has, I believe, in MS some study of your poems, which at some time may come to be printed) and Nettleship, whom Rossetti knows, and who has printed a book on R. Browning. I have been told that Nettleship at one time when *Leaves of Grass* was out of print and scarce, parted with his last guinea or two to buy a copy. . . .[22]

Such striking news as this threw into sharp relief the comparative neglect of Whitman at home, and it is not strange that in his first long letter to Dowden, written in January, 1872, the poet spoke with quiet bitterness of his reception in America:

There is one point touched by you in the Westminster criticism that if occasion arise should be dwelt on with more stress—and that is defended—stating the attitude of general denial and sneering which magazines, editors, authors, publishers, "critics" etc in the United States hold toward *Leaves of Grass* and myself as author of it. As to *Democratic Vistas,* it remains quite unread, uncalled for, here in America.

If you write again for publication about my books, or have opportunity to influence any forthcoming article on them, I think it would be a proper and an even essential part of such article to distinctly include the important facts (for facts they are) that *Leaves of Grass* and their author are contemptuously ignored by the recognized literary organs here in the United States, rejected by the publishing houses here, the author turned out of a government clerkship and deprived of his means of support by a Head of Department at Washington solely on account of having written the book.[23]

The following fall, September 3, 1872, Dowden renewed the invitation he had made a year before that Whitman should, if he accepted Tennyson's suggestion to come to England, extend his visit to Ireland: "We think that *you* are just the communicator of vitality and joy that *we* require. . . . And I have not a doubt that your personal presence in England would do much toward bringing the time when the recognition of your power and soundness in art and literature must become general."[24] Whitman was so minded to re-

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 224-5. In a later letter, October 15, Dowden wrote of the Whitman enthusiasts, Roden Noel and Standish O'Grady.

[23] *Traubel,* I, 320.

[24] *Ibid.*, II, 80.

spond that he was actually on the point of taking passage when suddenly an inner voice called imperiously, "Stay where you are, Walt Whitman."[25] Bram Stoker tells us that he and Dowden had made arrangements for Whitman to divide his stay in Dublin between his own bachelor quarters and Dowden's home, and that they had made provisional arrangements for Whitman to give a lecture which would have netted the poet at least a hundred pounds sterling.[26] But Whitman heeded the warning of his *alter ego,* and the tragic misfortune of his stroke of paralysis the following February effectively stilled the anticipations of his European friends. When Dowden heard of the calamity he wrote one of his finest letters:

> We give our grief to you with the reserve that after all Walt Whitman has not been really laid hold of by chance and change—that after all he eludes them and remains altogether untouched. And if I should happen to live longer than you I believe I should have the same conviction about what death could do to you. . . .[27]

During the months that followed, Whitman, in no position for continued correspondence, kept to the reassuring practice of sending newspaper items which let his friends know of his condition. Dowden grew anxious when he read in a Camden newspaper that Whitman was "ill and indigent," and wrote to John Burroughs on June 9, 1875, with the plea, "I shall like much to hear from you now and then, as I don't care to ask Whitman himself to write, and all that concerns him is of interest to me."[28] The rest of Dowden's Whitman correspondence, too long to be quoted here, is a cumulative testimony to the practical quality of his friendship. The four letters that he wrote to the poet in 1876,[29] for instance, are of special interest in revealing the energy with which he sought to introduce the *Leaves of Grass* to new readers, not only to widen foreign appreciation but to aid Whitman materially by subscriptions to his books. It will be remembered that this year was the one in which English friends sought to relieve the poet's poverty, being aroused by the quoting in England of the *West Jersey Press* article of January, 1876, which advertised his need. For this emergency Dowden acted in Ireland as W. M. Rossetti's foremost assistant. He did more than collect

[25] *Ibid.,* II, 374.
[26] Stoker, *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving,* II, 98.
[27] *Traubel,* I, 441.
[28] *Ibid.,* III, 216.
[29] These letters may be read in chronological order as follows: *Traubel,* I, 299; I, 301; I, 122; II, 90.

subscriptions; he was an eloquent defender of the *Leaves*. Bram Stoker has left a very readable account of his activity.[30]

Dowden sent his last greeting to Whitman on the boisterous occasion of Whitman's seventy-second birthday. He wrote: "I wish you better health, if that may be, but in any case we have the happiness of knowing that you are sane in heart and head, and that you must feel how your best self is abroad in the world and active for good. I give you my reverence." And Whitman responded, "Always the faithful Dowden! It is a good hand across the sea."[31] He felt deeply the uncommon strength of Dowden's support. It is needless to set down here his frequent testimonies; it is sufficient to record his simple declaration, "I have always felt as if, if I had any right to pride at all, I might be proud to have convinced Dowden that I am not entirely useless."[32]

[30] *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving*, II, 95-6.
[31] *In Re Walt Whitman*, p. 304.
[32] *Traubel*, III, 42.

THE CABLE FAMILY IN INDIANA

GEORGE S. WYKOFF
Purdue University

IT IS PERHAPS not generally known that the ancestors of George Washington Cable (1844-1925), the author of the delightfully charming short stories and novels of Creole life and people in Louisiana, for two generations lived in Indiana; that the grandparents, on both sides, emigrated there from the East; that the father and mother met, loved, married; that the father engaged in business in this state. The father's name, like the son's, was George Washington Cable; the mother's name was Rebecca Boardman Cable.

I

The ancestry of the mother, Rebecca Boardman, is much easier to trace than that of the father, because of the existence and availability of recorded materials.

She was a lineal descendant of the founder of the Boardman family in America—Samuel Boardman, or, as the name was spelled in his time, Boreman (and later, Bordman). Samuel Boreman was English-born-and-bred. He was of the fifth generation of the family in England, being able to trace his ancestry back to William Boreman of Claydon, near Banbury, Oxfordshire, England, who lived about 1525. Samuel, himself, was baptized at Banbury, August 20, 1615. He came to America, settling first at Ipswich, Massachusetts, in 1638, then removed to Wethersfield, Connecticut, in 1641, where he married, the same year, Mary, the daughter of John Betts; where he became assistant to the governor; and where he died in 1673. Samuel and Mary Betts were the parents of eight children.[1]

The ancestry of Rebecca Boardman, the mother of George Washington Cable, beginning with Samuel Boreman, is genealogically as follows:

Daniel Bordman (1658-1724/5), the son of Samuel Bordman (Boreman), married, in 1683, Hannah Wright (died 1746) and was the father of twelve children.

Benjamin (born 1705/6), the eleventh child of Daniel, married, in 1735, Deborah Goodrich (1705-1755), and was the father of five children.

[1] *The Abridged Compendium of American Genealogy*, II, 390.

Thaddeus (born 1743), the third child of Benjamin, married Rebecca Smith. Of their eight children, the eldest was Amos, who became the father of Rebecca and the grandfather of George Washington Cable.[2]

This Amos Boardman (1767-1839), who eventually migrated to Indiana, was born at Sharon, Connecticut, July 23, 1767. There he married, March 20, 1792, Zadia Marchant, the daughter of Amos Marchant, a resident of the same town. Three years later they were residing at Harpersfield, Otsego County, New York, and, according to another authority, lived also for a time at Seneca Falls, New York. Two children were born of this marriage. Some time after the death of his first wife, Amos Boardman married Sylvia Noble. She had been born in Sheffield, Massachusetts, November 27, 1779, and was the sister of the wife of Amos' brother Charles. After his second marriage, Amos resided in the town of Hector, Cayuga County, New York, where the four eldest children—two sons and two daughters—of this marriage were born.[3]

In 1807 Amos Boardman and his family removed to southeastern Indiana, settling about a half mile north of Wilmington, in Dearborn County. Wilmington was on the old state road leading to Madison and was about eight miles southwest of Lawrenceburg, in the southern part of Hogan Township, or, as it was named until 1852, Laughery Township. Six more children—one son and five daughters—were born to the Boardmans in Indiana. Rebecca was the sixth child of this second marriage.[4]

With Amos, described as "a man of family,"[5] had come his brother, David G. Boardman. Under "Original Land Sales," there is a record that "a portion of Section 25 [in Hogan Township, was] sold in 1809 to Amos and D. G. Boardman."[6] There is also a reference to the Boardman family in an article written in 1876, referring to the North Hogan stream sixty years before: "There were a few cabins dispersed along the banks of the North Hogan, from its mouth up as far as the block-houses, a distance of about four miles, beyond which was unbroken wilderness. Captain Jim Bruce, Amor and Henry Bruce lived near the block-house. The cabins further

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 268.

[3] *Boardman Genealogy 1525-1895*, pp. 366-367. It is in the generation of Amos Boardman that the *a* enters the name.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 366-367.

[5] *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, p. 482.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 479.

down were occupied by the McKinneys, Powells, Bordmans, Huffmans, and other pioneer settlers."[7]

The Boardmans, then, apparently lived a typical pioneer life. A small cabin served as their home. They did their cooking over a fireplace, for there were few cook-stoves even by 1820, and "perhaps one family in five had a stove by 1840." For food there were corn bread, the staple article, hominy, some kind of meat, such as game, and later chickens and hogs, and, as civilization progressed, vegetables and fruit. Clothing was probably made from skins and linsey cloth, and then home-made woollen materials, although "a bear-skin overcoat, a beaver hat, a pair of buckskin gloves lined with squirrel fur, were considered good taste down to the Civil War."[8]

The following statement, from an account concerning the pioneers of Hogan Township, was written in 1876 by George W. Lane:

> Amos Boardman remained in the county [Dearborn] a few years after the war [War of 1812], and then removed to Ripley County on the State road from Lawrenceburg to Indianapolis, where he opened a large farm and kept one of the most popular stopping places for the accommodation of the numerous travelers on that road, which before railroad times was quite a business.[9]

Only one other contemporary has left information concerning Amos Boardman. This was Judge Alfred Johnson Cotton, teacher, minister, orator, and lecturer, who published his poems, an autobiography, and a history of the early settlements and settlers in and around Dearborn County, in his book, *Cotton's Keepsake* (1858). In describing Peckham's Schoolhouse, he wrote:

> My first ministerial services in the west were rendered in this community, at good old Father and Mother Montgomery's. . . . I have left home before sunrise of a precious Sabbath morning, traveled all the way on foot, a distance, then, of some eighteen miles, preached at eleven, footed it back to Boardman's, preached again at four, and then footed it home by early bedtime. . . . Some of my fair audience were clad in their striped linen and plain linsey dresses, and looked quite tasty and fine at that. Gentlemen in moccasins, buckskin overalls, and linsey hunting shirts. Yet we had good time and got happy.[10]

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 552, Chapter on Manchester Township.
[8] Logan Esary, *A History of Indiana from its Exploration to 1850*, Chapter XVIII, "The Pioneers and Their Social Life," pp. 420-424.
[9] *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, p. 483.
[10] Alfred J. Cotton, *Cotton's Keepsake*, p. 409.

And of the village of Clinton, Judge Cotton wrote: "Here used to live my lamented friend, Amos Boardman, before referred to."[11]

The Boardman name, naturally, occurs in the census records of the State of Indiana. In the 1820 census, under Ripley County (no township given), there is the name of Amos Boardman, with the following information concerning his family:

Free white males to the age of 10 years	1
Free white males between 10 and 16 years	1
Free white males between 16 and 18 years	1
Free white males between 18 and 26 years	2
Free white males between 26 and 45 years	0
Free white males above 45 years	1
Free white females to the age of 10 years	3
Free white females between 10 and 16 years	1
Free white females between 16 and 26 years	0
Free white females between 26 and 45 years	1
Free white females above 45 years	0

Engaged in agriculture, 4; in commerce, 0;
in manufacturing, 0.[12]

In the 1830 census, under Ripley County (again, no township is given), Amos bordman (the name is so written) is listed with the following family:

Males between 15 and 20 years	1
Males between 60 and 70 years	1
Females under five years of age	1
Females between 5 and 10 years	1
Females between 10 and 15 years	2
Females between 15 and 20 years	1
Females between 50 and 60 years	1[13]

Amos Boardman died August 24, 1839. His widow, Sylvia Boardman, died less than a year later, on April 6, 1840.[14]

About David G. Boardman, the brother of Amos, and his family, the Indiana Census Records give, under Dearborn County, Laughery (or Laughry) Township, the following: In 1820: five males between the ages of 1 and 10 years; one between 16 and 26; two

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 410.
[12] *Photostatic Copies, Census of Indiana, 1820* (Indiana State Library), Vol. 6.
[13] *Photostatic Copies, Census of Indiana, 1830*, Vol. 12.
[14] *Boardman Genealogy*, p. 367.

between 26 and 45; one female between 16 and 26; one between 26 and 45; one over 45; persons engaged in agriculture, 2.[15] In 1830: two males between the ages of 5 and 10; three between 10 and 15; two between 15 and 25; one between 40 and 50; three females under 5 years; one between 5 and 10; one between 30 and 40; and one between 60 and 70.[16]

(Parenthetically, it might be stated that Charles Boardman, another brother of Amos, after having lived in Sheffield, Massachusetts, most of his life, also emigrated westward: "In 1838, when sixty-eight years old, he and his wife removed to the township of Delaware, Ripley County, Indiana, in the southeast part of the State, not far from the Ohio River. Their sons, Amos and Ezra, went with them, and died there in 1842 and 1853, and their father, Charles, died there also December 14, 1851. Ruth, the wife and mother, returned in 1853 to Sheffield, where some of her children were living, and died May 28, 1862. The emigration of the family is explained by the fact that the family of Charles' brother, Amos, who had married a sister of Ruth, were settled there and apparently prospering."[17])

So much for the grandparents of George Washington Cable, on his mother's side.

II

His mother, Rebecca Boardman, the sixth child of Amos Boardman, was born November 20, 1813, at Wilmington, Indiana. Her girlhood was a typically pioneer one, and her character, if one may judge by later descriptions of it, was in accordance with that philosophy of life attributed to the early pioneers and summarized thus by Professor Esary:

> Thorough-going democracy, freedom from all restraint, elbow room, believers in Christianity though careless of creeds and forms, simplicity in dress and houses, carelessness of accumulated wealth, life above property, neglectfulness of business, enjoyment of plain society and discussion, rarely calling into action their great reserve power, on easy terms with the world, believing that the consequences of one's deeds return to the doer—these are some of the leading principles of their [the pioneers'] philosophy of life.[18]

Biographers of Cable, with one exception, have given only meager descriptions of the character of his mother, Rebecca Board-

[15] *Photostatic Copies, Census of Indiana, 1820,* Vol. 2.
[16] *Photostatic Copies, Census of Indiana, 1830,* Vol. 2.
[17] *Boardman Genealogy,* p. 368.
[18] Logan Esary, *op. cit.,* pp. 420-421.

man. Sarah K. Bolton describes her as "a hopeful, cheerful Christian, who . . . lived for one purpose—to bring up her children to honor God and make the world better, and she . . . lived to see her prayers answered and her labors bear fruit."[19] Miss Mildred Lewis Rutherford stresses the hatred of slavery in her character: "On all sides a child imbibes the views of the mother more than those of the father. It was natural that the mother should have had very strong opinions concerning abolition, as a horror of slavery had probably been taught her from childhood, and that the son should obtain his views from her."[20] H. A. Toulmin, Jr., calls her "a woman of extraordinary character, of English-Puritan ancestry from the New England States,"[21] and W. S. Kennedy, writing from New Orleans, December 21, 1884, said that "Mr. Cable's mother . . . is an Indiana woman of strict Presbyterian principles."[22] The influence of her life on the character and writings of her son is mentioned by several writers. Henry C. Vedder says that "from her the novelist derives that strain of Puritanism so evident in his character as in his work,"[23] and the anonymous biographer in the *National Encyclopedia of American Biography* states that "through her he derived traits of character that may be called distinctively northern."[24] Professor Baskerville writes: "The old New England stock represented in his mother constitutes, it would seem, the warp and woof of his [Cable's] nature, though it has been not a little influenced by the characteristics of his Gallic neighbors."[25] And George E. Waring, Jr., in the *Century Magazine*, said:

> Not a little of his [Cable's] peculiar quality, and very much of his peculiar development, may be traced to the Puritan element in his composition—a Puritanism inherited, cultivated, and stalwart, but a Puritanism mellowed by the sunny sky under which he has grown, humanized by the open and cordial habit of Southern life, and made wise and forbearing and discreet—almost made not to be Puritanism at all—by an all-embracing and ever-vigilant sense of humor, which is as quick to check his own act as to catch his neighbor's lapse; a sense of humor which ripples at every shoaling of the serious stream of his life and work.[26]

[19] Sarah K. Bolton, *Famous American Authors*, p. 349.
[20] Mildred Lewis Rutherford, *The South in History and Literature*, p. 502.
[21] H. A. Toulmin, Jr., *Social Historians*, pp. 36-37.
[22] W. S. Kennedy, *Literary World*, XVI (January 24, 1885), p. 30.
[23] Henry C. Vedder, *American Writers of Today*, p. 262.
[24] *National Encyclopedia of American Biography*, I, 533.
[25] W. M. Baskerville, "George W. Cable," *The Chautauquan*, XXV (1897), p. 180.
[26] George E. Waring, Jr., "G. W. Cable," *The Century Magazine*, I (1882), p. 602.

But the best and most comprehensive account of Rebecca Boardman's character is found in the books of Mrs. Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé, the novelist's daughter. In the introduction to a selection of Cable's stories, she says that the characteristics which her father inherited from Rebecca Boardman were "an intense energy, an eager, far-reaching ambition, a vivacity like that of quicksilver, always restless, incessantly doing, doing."[27] And in her recent biography of her father, Mrs. Biklé quotes the account written by Cable of his mother, when she died in 1890, at the age of seventy-six:

> To her indomitable energy she added an unconquerable buoyancy of spirits, an intellectual ambition, a keen relish for social relations and a moral austerity naturally to be looked for in a descendant of the Pilgrims. Her supreme and constant characteristic was an heroic spirit. This feature belonged to the quietest hours and simplest tasks as much as to the greatest emergencies. She had at all times so emphatic a preference for the best way rather than the easier way of doing things, that often she almost seemed to choose the more difficult method because of its difficulty. She pursued all her tasks with a positive gaiety of temper. She had no such intolerance for anything else in life as she had for a spirit of indolence, whether it leaned toward ease or pleasure. She had many features of the artistic temperament: abhorrence of all ungenuineness and an intense love of the beautiful. She had a passion for flowers, and in the days of prosperity these were her most cherished wealth, and in the days of her severest adversity, when almost her whole means of livelihood depended upon her own diligence, she more than once not only surrounded herself with flowers where she had found none, but by the glad contagion of her energy set her whole neighborhood to gardening.[28]

And, in his early manhood, Cable had written of his mother and her influence: "All I am, in mind, in morals, in social position, in attainments, or in any good thing, I owe mainly to my noble mother."[29]

III

Not very much is known of the paternal ancestry of George Washington Cable. The Cable family was an old family of Colonial Virginia,[30] probably descended from English Cavalier stock,[31] which

[27] Lucy Leffingwell Cable, "The Story of the Author's Life" (Preface), in *The Cable Story Book*.
[28] Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé, *George W. Cable: His Life and Letters*, p. 4.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[30] *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, I, 490.
[31] *Outlook*, CXXXIX (1925), p. 213.

left England in the earliest years of the eighteenth century.[32] Mrs. John S. Kendall, however, writing in *The Library of Southern Literature*, says that "On the paternal side, Cable was of German descent, though his grandfather, George Cable, was a Virginian by birth,"[33] a view held also by H. A. Toulmin, Jr., (in his *Social Historians*) who writes that "The blood of the Dutch, English-Puritan, and German stocks are all mingled in his [the author's] veins. His grandfather was a German, George Cable, born in Virginia of the old family of Cables."[34] The Cabell family in Virginia was probably of the same line as the Cables, for "The Cabells originally spelled the name Cable, and their ancient coats of arms introduce the cable as an accessory."[35]

The grandfather of Cable, by name George Cable, was, we are at least sure, born in Virginia, of either English or German descent. He was a slaveholder. He married, during the first decade of the nineteenth century, Mary Stott, who had been born in Pennsylvania of Dutch ancestry.[36] Their son, George Washington Cable, father of the novelist, was born in Winchester, Virginia, on February 28, 1811.[37] When the son was still very young, the Cable family moved to Pennsylvania. Here the parents, George and Mary Stott Cable, having a decided prejudice against holding slaves, set their negroes free.[38] Some time later, between the years of 1820 and 1830, the family migrated to Indiana, probably by way of Pittsburgh and the Ohio River, and settled in Lawrenceburg Township, Dearborn County, not very far from the town of Lawrenceburg (formerly spelled Lawrenceburgh). The Cable name is missing from the 1820 Indiana Census; but the name of George Cable occurs in the 1830 census, under Lawrenceburg Township, Dearborn County, with the following family listed:

Males between 15 and 20 years	1
Males between 20 and 30 years	1
Males between 40 and 50 years	1
Females between 40 and 50 years	1[39]

No occupation is given.

[32] W. M. Baskerville, *op. cit.*, XXV, 179.
[33] Mrs. John S. Kendall, *Library of Southern Literature*, II, 619.
[34] H. A. Toulmin, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
[35] *Appleton's Cyclopaedia*, I, 490.
[36] Mrs. John S. Kendall, *op. cit.*, I, 619.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 619.
[38] H. A. Toulmin, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
[39] *Photostatic Copies, Census of Indiana, 1830*, Vol. 2.

IV

In southeastern Indiana, then, the son, George Washington Cable, grown to manhood, met, in his early twenties, Rebecca Boardman, fell in love with her, and married her. The wedding took place in Ripley County, about eighteen miles from Lawrenceburg, on January 9, 1834. A brief notice of it, under the heading, "Hymeneal," appeared in the *Palladium*, a political newspaper published weekly at Lawrenceburg, on January 25, 1834:

MARRIED—On the 9th inst. by Rev. Daniel Plummer, Mr. George W. Cable to Miss Rebecca Boardman, daughter of Amos Boardman, Esq. of Ripley County.[40]

The young Cable family began their married life in Lawrenceburg. Their first child, a daughter, Emily, was born there on December 12, 1834.[41] The young husband followed the trade of a cooper. Apparently, he was kept busy, for in the issue of the Lawrenceburg *Palladium* for Saturday, October 18, 1834, there appeared an advertisement—which was printed also in the three succeeding issues—reading as follows:

WANTED IMMEDIATELY

One or two JOURNEYMEN COOPERS, to whom the highest price in cash will be given; and constant employment through the season.

G. W. CABLE

Lawrenceburgh, Oct. 7, 1834. 39—3w[42]

The business activities of the young Cable increased. Perhaps he was influenced somewhat by the prosperity of his father-in-law, who was keeping "a stopping place for the accommodation of travelers" on the road from Lawrenceburg to Indianapolis. While the advertisements for journeymen coopers were still appearing, there was printed in the Lawrenceburg *Palladium* for November 8, 1834, and in the three succeeding numbers, the following announcement:

HOTEL

The undersigned has just taken possession of the TAVERN STAND in *New Lawrenceburgh,* formerly occupied by B. S. Noble, where he will be ready at all times to accommodate *Travellers,* and all others who may honor him with their custom. He pledges himself that no pains shall be spared to render due satisfaction. G. W. CABLE

[40] Lawrenceburg *Palladium*, Vol. X, No. 2 (January 25, 1834).
[41] *Boardman Genealogy*, p. 474.
[42] Lawrenceburg *Palladium*, Vol. X, No. 40 (October 18, 1834).

He has also A TWO STORY BRICK DWELLING HOUSE well calculated for an ordinary family, which he will rent on reasonable terms, for one year or more, at the option of the tenant.

G. W. C.

Lawrenceburgh, Nov. 4th, 1834. 43—3w[43]

Perhaps the hotel business prospered; perhaps it required more time than a busy cooper could devote to it; perhaps the trade of a cooper underwent a business depression. From all appearances, however, George W. Cable was no longer to be a cooper, if one may judge by the following advertisement, which appeared in three consecutive issues of the Lawrenceburg *Palladium*, beginning with the January 31, 1835, number:

PUBLIC SALE

I will expose to public sale on Saturday the 7th day of Feb. next, at my shop in Lawrenceburgh, about six thousand COOPER STUFF completely dry, also a variety of Cooper's Tools, among which are TRESS HOOPS of several sizes, JOINTING BLOCK, PLANES, STOCK HOWELS, &c.

Also, one set of IRON BINDING TOOLS

Two Grindstones & 1 Ten Plate Stove

A credit of four months will be given on all sums over three dollars, by giving bond and security. Sale to commence at 10 o'clock on said day.

G. W. CABLE

Jan. 24, 1835 2—ts[44]

Again one must resort to speculation. Perhaps the Tavern Stand at New Lawrenceburg did not prosper as rapidly as its proprietor wished; perhaps he felt that there were better commercial opportunities elsewhere. Beginning with the number of the Lawrenceburg *Palladium* dated December 19, 1835, the following notice was printed in the five succeeding issues:

NOTICE

All persons indebted to the undersigned, either by note or by book account, are requested to come forward and settle the same, by the first day of March next. As all accounts not adjusted by that time, will be left in the hands of an officer for collection.

Lawrenceburgh, Dec. 16, 1835. G. W. CABLE[45]

[43] *Ibid.*, Vol. X, No. 43 (November 8, 1834).
[44] *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, No. 3 (January 31, 1835).
[45] *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, No. 49 (December 19, 1835).

Whether the hotel was sold, we cannot say. There is a record in the Recorder's Office of Dearborn County which says that George W. Cable and Rebecca Cable sold to Whiting Risbey In-Lots Nos. 89 and 90 in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, on August 4, 1835.[46] There is no further description of the property. It may have included the "two-story brick dwelling house" advertised for rent in the preceding November; it may have been only a certain section of land. The date of sale is four months previous to that of the advertisement which indicates the senior Cable's intention to leave Lawrenceburg. Some time in 1836 George W. and Rebecca Boardman Cable, with their daughter, Emily, removed to Greensburg, Decatur County, Indiana, where the husband again entered business, though of what kind—being a cooper, running a hotel, or some other variety—is not known. He failed in the financial crisis of 1837.[47]

His wife, Rebecca, then persuaded him to leave Indiana, and try anew the fortunes of business in New Orleans, that thriving port just then coming into prominence. Before her marriage, she had made frequent visits to an older sister, "whose husband traded with the Indians, and traveled on storeboats and rafts down the Mississippi to New Orleans, whence he brought back beautiful goods, and handsome gifts for the wife and little sister, and, more thrilling than all, wonderful accounts of the great city. . . . To this city the little woman turned her eyes longingly, when removal from her home seemed a necessity."[48]

Thus the Cable family came to leave Indiana, in 1837. The husband has been described as "a man of sunny temperament, social, with exuberant spirits, energetic in business, but unable to keep the fortunes he had made."[49] Mrs. Biklé gives a more detailed account of his appearance and character:

> The father was a man full of energy and enterprise, of unusual height and commanding presence. "I can see him now," wrote one of his daughters, many years later, "at the age of thirty-six—five feet eleven inches and carrying well his weight of 194 pounds." . . . From the father came other traits [of the novelist]: a pervasive sense of humor, a buoyant acceptance of adverse fate, and a genial warmth of nature that was a clear heritage from his Southern forbears.[50]

[46] *Record L-2*, Recorder's Office, Dearborn County, Lawrenceburg, Indiana.
[47] *Boardman Genealogy*, p. 474.
[48] Mrs. J. S. Kendall, *op. cit.*, II, 619.
[49] Sarah K. Bolton, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
[50] Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé, *George W. Cable*, pp. 2, 4.

The members of both families—the Cables and the Boardmans—were steady, honest, industrious, plodding people, living happy lives devoid of sensationalism and political ambition. No mention of the names Cable or Boardman is made in the civil organization of the counties in which they lived, in the lists of names of soldiers of the War of 1812, the judges of the various courts, the members of the legislature, the board of magistrates and county commissioners, or other county officers,—at least, no mention is made in the lists which appear in the histories of the counties in which the Boardmans and Cables resided, or in the history of Lawrenceburg, its business, mercantile and banking, its manufacturing, its churches, or its municipal affairs.

Five other children were born to George W. and Rebecca Boardman Cable: John, on the journey to New Orleans in 1837, Mary in 1840, Frances Antoinette in 1842, George Washington on October 12, 1844, and James Boardman in 1846,—these last four at New Orleans. The two eldest, Emily and John, died of scarlet fever in 1845. The others grew to maturity.

In New Orleans, George W. Cable, the father, again entered business, this time as a dealer in western produce, furnishing supplies to the grocery stores and to the magnificent river steamers.[51] He also purchased several steamboats on Lake Pontchartrain and the Mississippi River, engaging as well in the business of lumbering and brickmaking, about forty miles from New Orleans, on the Tchefuncta River.[52] His business projects prospered until 1849, when there came a second disastrous failure, due to an unexpected catastrophe. "Two Mississippi River steamboats into which he had put a great deal of money were burned, with their cargoes, to the water's edge."[53] His health was shattered also, and after ten years of invalidism he died, in New Orleans, on February 28, 1859, his forty-eighth birthday. His wife, Rebecca Boardman, survived until July 31, 1890, when she died, in her own home, at Northampton, Massachusetts, the city to which her son, the novelist, had removed in 1885.[54]

George Washington Cable, the novelist and short-story writer, was fourteen years old when his father died. He left school and became a clerk, fought on the Confederate side in the Civil War, studied civil engineering, reported for the New Orleans *Picayune*, became accountant to a cotton dealer, and finally entered the pro-

[51] Mrs. Kendall, *op. cit.*, II, 619.
[52] Lucy L. C. Biklé, *George W. Cable*, p. 3.
[53] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[54] *Boardman Genealogy*, p. 474.

fession of literature and wrote about twenty volumes—novels and short stories—most of them dealing with the "local color" of the Creole and old French life in New Orleans and in Louisiana. His later residence was at Northampton, Massachusetts, but he died in Florida on January 31, 1925.

If the Cable family had continued to reside in Indiana after 1837, and George Washington Cable had been born there; if he had been educated there, grown to young manhood there, and made his place of residence in that state, the assumption is perhaps safe that he would still have followed a literary career, and that his genius would have been, not national or general, but as it likewise was in Louisiana, that of a "local color" writer. Whether he would have found his material in the backward, picturesque peoples of Brown County, whether among the scattered Quaker settlements, whether among the scenes of incipient college and university life, whether historically in the romantic subject of the sturdy pioneers and their conflicts with the Indians, whether in the uneventful lives of the general agricultural population of the state, or whether among any other similar "local color" scenes or peoples,—all considerations such as these can be, and necessarily must so remain, matters only of conjecture.

FIVE SOURCES OF EDGAR ALLAN POE'S "PINAKIDIA"

EARL LESLIE GRIGGS
The University of Michigan

IN THE August, 1836, number of *The Southern Literary Messenger* Poe published his "Pinakidia," a series of items gathered from his commonplace book. This article, with its references to ten literatures, seems to be the result of vast learning, but a study of the sources shows that many of the references are borrowed. Although Poe says in his essay that "Most of the following article is original," a *not*, as Professor Woodberry suggests,[1] has very obviously been omitted. Of the 172 items in the essay, over one-third are taken directly from other sources. Griswold apparently suspected plagiarism, as he omitted many of the paragraphs in re-publishing the essay, but his omissions are not systematic.

The various paragraphs in the "Pinakidia" are often striking and *recherché*; but the author selected them not for oddity alone, and the fact that they were probably not originally chosen with a view to publication indicates that Poe was taking a short cut, his only means, to apparent learning.

The following notes refer to Poe's use of five authorities; namely, Isaac Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature*,[2] Baron Bielfeld's *Elements of Universal Erudition*,[3] Jacob Bryant's *Mythology*,[4] James Montgomery's *Lectures on Literature*,[5] and J. F. Cooper's *Excursions in Switzerland*.[6] Poe found these five books worth his perusal; but he was a busy man and very evidently did not read the volumes entire; for ninety per cent of the Disraeli references are from a single volume, all but one of the references to Montgomery's lectures are from a single lecture, and most of the references drawn from Bryant are to be found in the first volume. The borrowings from Bielfeld alone suggest that Poe read the entire work. Apparently then, Poe skimmed through these books, some of them indeed unusual, stop-

[1] G. E. Woodberry, *Edgar Allan Poe* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1885), p. 96.
[2] Isaac Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature* (Riverside Press, London, 1864).
[3] J. F. von Bielfeld, *Elements of Universal Erudition*. [Translated by Hooper, London, 1770.]
[4] Jacob Bryant, *A New System, or an Analysis of Ancient Mythology* (J. Walker, London, 1807).
[5] James Montgomery, *Lectures on Literature* (Harpers, New York, 1833).
[6] J. F. Cooper, *Excursions in Switzerland* (Paris, 1836).

ping only occasionally to read them carefully, but constantly on the alert for new or strange information.

The following notes consist of the secondary sources only; that is, the references which Poe took *en masse* from the sources mentioned above. The investigation of the primary sources; that is, Poe's original comments on literature, etc., Dr. Thomas Ollive Mabbott and I are still making. In this essay, I give by number, according to the order of the paragraphs in the *Virginia Edition* of Poe's works,[7] the items in the "Pinakidia," recording after the number the page references to the sources.

3. Disraeli, C. of L., *Turkish Spy,* p. 44.[8]
6. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Mathematics,* Book I, Ch. xiix-lxxvii, Vol. II, p. 89.[9]
15. Disraeli, C. of L., *Diaries—Moral, Historical and Critical,* Vol. II, p. 388.
27. Montgomery, L. on L., *Various Classes of Poetry,* Vol. I, p. 147.[10]
28. Disraeli, C. of L., *History of New Words,* Vol. III, p. 350.
29. Cooper, *Excursions in Switzerland,* Letter No. 7, p. 60.[11]
31. Disraeli, C. of L., *Pantomimical Characters,* Vol. II, p. 299.
32. Disraeli, C. of L., *Extemporal Comedies,* Vol. II, p. 305. This letter may be found in Shuckburgh's translation of Cicero's Letters [Publ. London, 1900], letter 470.
34. Disraeli, C. of L., *Extemporal Comedies,* Vol. II, p. 305.
35. Disraeli, C. of L., *Massinger, Milton, and the Italian Theater,* Vol. II, p. 314.
37. Disraeli, C. of L., *Licensers of the Press,* Vol. II, p. 411.
39. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical Imitations and Similarities,* Vol. II, p. 267.
41. Disraeli, C. of L., *Drinking Customs in England,* Vol. III, p. 24.
57. Bryant, *Mythology, Gods of Greece,* Vol. I, p. 395.[12]
58. Bryant, *Mythology, Gods of Greece,* Vol. I, p. 392.
60. Bryant, *Mythology, The Deluge,* Vol. III, p. 27.
61. Bryant, *Mythology, of the Dorians, Pelasgi, Cancones, Myrmidons and Arcadians,* Vol. V, p. 48.
62. Bryant, *Mythology, Ninus and Semiramis,* Vol. II, p. 376.

[7] *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe,* edited by J. A. Harrison (Crowell, New York, 1902).

[8] Isaac Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature* (London, 1864); henceforth abbreviated *C. of L.*

[9] J. F. von Bielfeld, *Elements of Universal Erudition* (London, 1770); henceforth abbreviated *E. of U. E.*

[10] James Montgomery, *Lectures on Literature* (Harpers, New York, 1833); henceforth abbreviated *L. on L.*

[11] James F. Cooper, *Excursions in Switzerland* (Paris, 1836).

[12] Jacob Bryant, *A New System, or An Analysis of Ancient Mythology* (London, 1807); henceforth abbreviated *Mythology.*

64. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical and Grammatical Deaths,* Vol. II, p. 93.
65. Disraeli, C. of L., *Pamphlets,* Vol. I, p. 443.
66. Disraeli, C. of L., *Mysteries, Moralities, Farces and Soteries,* Vol. II, p. 20.
67. Disraeli, C. of L., *Critical Sagacity and Happy Conjecture or Bentley's Milton,* Vol. II, p. 36.
68. Disraeli, C. of L., *Literary Dutch,* Vol. III, p. 74.
70. Bryant, *Mythology, Taph. Tuph. Taphos.,* Vol. II, p. 173.
71. Bryant, *Mythology, Temple Science,* Vol. I, p. 393 (old copy).
72. Bryant, *Mythology, Pator and Patra,* Vol. I, p. 363.
73. Montgomery, L. on L., *The Form of Poetry,* Vol. I, pp. 84-85.
74. Montgomery, L. on L., *The Form of Poetry,* Vol. I, p. 87.
75. Montgomery, L. on L., *The Form of Poetry,* Vol. I, p. 91.
76. Montgomery, L. on L., *The Form of Poetry,* Vol. I, p. 93.
77. Montgomery, L. on L., *The Form of Poetry,* Vol. I, p. 85.
88. Disraeli, C. of L., *Abelard and Eloisa,* Vol. I, p. 215.
89. Disraeli, C. of L., *Metempsychosis,* Vol. I, p. 268.
91. Disraeli, C. of L., *Pasquin and Marforio,* Vol I, p. 289.
92. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical Imitations and Similarities,* Vol. II, p. 262.
93. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical Imitations and Similarities,* Vol. II, pp. 263-264.
96. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical Imitations and Similarities,* Vol. II, p. 268.
97. Disraeli, C. of L., *Poetical Imitations and Similarities,* Vol. II, p. 271.
108. Disraeli, C. of L., *Predication,* Vol. IV, p. 165.
110. Disraeli, C. of L., *Dedication,* Vol. I, p. 438.
122. Disraeli, C. of L., *Pantomomical Characters,* Vol. II, p. 294.
125. Disraeli, C. of L., *Literary Journals,* Vol. I, p. 62.
128. Disraeli, C. of L., *Patrons,* Vol. I, p. 142.
138. Disraeli, C. of L., *Philosophy of Proverbs,* Vol. III, p. 358. (Disraeli's note is the same as Poe's, but he says the quotation is from Menander.)
139. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Ancient History,* Bk. III, Ch. V, xiii, Vol. III, p. 105.
150. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Natural Philosophy,* Bk. I, Ch. XLVIII, iv, Vol. I, p. 407.
151. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Versification,* Bk. II, Ch. VII, xx, Vol. II, p. 283.
153. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Poetry,* Bk. II, Ch. VI, v, Vol. II, p. 194.
155. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Chronology,* Bk. III, Ch. III, xxxvi, Vol. III, p. 62.
156. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Knowledge of Authors,* Bk. III, Ch. XXVII, i, Vol. III, p. 427.
157. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Metaphysics,* Bk. I, Ch. XLVII, i, Vol. I, p. 388.
159. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Eloquence,* Bk. II, Ch. IV, xviii, Vol. II, p. 167.

160. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Versification,* Bk. II, Ch. VII, xiii, Vol. II, p. 275.
161. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *History,* Bk. III, Ch. IV, vi, Vol. III, p. 75.
162. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Medals and Coins,* Bk. III, Ch. IX, x, Vol. III, p. 251.
163. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Knowledge of Authors,* Bk. III, Ch. XXVII, vi, Vol. III, p. 433.
164. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Oriental Languages,* Bk. III, Ch. XIX, iv, Vol. III, p. 331.
168. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *Medals and Coins,* Bk. III, Ch. IX, x, Vol. III, p. 252.
169. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *On Theology,* "of the Exegesis and the Hermeneutic," Bk. I, Ch. III, v, Vol. I, p. 35.
170. Bielfeld, E. of U. E., *On Theology,* "of Sacred Criticism," Bk. I, Ch. V, v, Vol. I, p. 46.

NOTES AND QUERIES

NOAH WEBSTER AND *THE CONQUEST OF CANÄAN*

THEODORE A. ZUNDER
Hunter College of the City of New York

Timothy Dwight probably first met Noah Webster at Yale College, where the latter graduated in 1778; and where Dwight (Yale, 1769) was tutor from 1771 to 1777. After they had both left Yale, these two seem to have kept in touch with each other. Dwight, who from 1783 to 1795 acted as minister of the Congregational Church and maintained a school at Greenfield Hill in Fairfield, Connecticut, must have read Webster's *Grammatical Institutes* (1783-1785); and Webster, whose more varied experiences included teaching and lecturing on the English language, read and critically appraised Dwight's *The Conquest of Canäan,* which was published in America and in England during 1785.

Webster, in his effort to secure a livelihood, edited *The American Magazine. Containing A Miscellaneous Collection of Original and other Valuable Essays, In Prose and Verse, And Calculated Both For Instruction and Amusement,* the first issue of which appeared in New York in December, 1787, and the last in November, 1788. In this ill-fated and short-lived magazine Webster published some of his friend's prose and poetry.[1] The July number[2] contained a letter dated New York, July 4, 1788, and signed "An American," in which the author, probably Webster himself, censured an English reviewer of *The Conquest of Canäan* who had said in the *European Magazine* for February, 1788:

> Here America is obviously placed before us under the allegory of the Israelites having left Egypt, which means the British government, and about to settle themselves by force of arms. Hanniel who advises to return to Egypt, and the difficulties he foretells, represents the Loyalists, and Joshua's reply sums up the arguments of the American patriots. But this allegory is not regularly carried through the work.[3]

In commenting upon this allegorical interpretation, Webster observes that such opinions are "*obviously* erroneous" and that "the separation of America from Great-Britain wounds the narrow hearts of splenetic English politicians, and the mortifications they have suffered by that event

[1] See *American Magazine,* pp. 42-47; 99-103; 58-59; 507-508. See also *ibid.,* pp. 265-266; 588-590.

[2] *American Magazine,* pp. 562-566. The style appears to be that of Webster, and at the beginning of the article the writer observes that he has "the honor of some acquaintance with that gentleman [Dwight], and with some circumstances respecting his Poem of which you appear to be ignorant. . . ."

[3] *European Magazine,* XIII, 83. The reviewer identifies Joshua as General Washington. See *ibid.,* XIII, 82.

have disordered their minds."[4] Webster then exposes the weakness of other critical judgments which appeared in this same English magazine during March and April, 1788.[5] With righteous indignation he finally advises the "London Reviewers to *understand the works they review*, before they indulge so much ridicule and severity, or decide with peremptory assurance, on the merit of the writings."[6]

In order to assist his friend in humbling the English reviewer, Timothy Dwight wrote him the following letter of which portions were published in Webster's letter in the *American Magazine*.[7] This letter of June 6, 1788, now in the Webster Papers at the New York Public Library, reads as follows:

Greenfield June 6 1788.

Dear Sir

Accept of my acknowledgements for your several favours, & the presents, which accompanied them. Particularly, let me thank you for your obliging designs to befriend my reputation, as a poet, & vindicate the Conquest of Canaan from those, which you esteem illiberal remarks of the Reviewers. At the present time, it is out of my power to attend to that subject, being occupied by business of a nature more interesting to myself, & family. I should however be gratified by a sight of the observations, they have been pleased to make; & would thank you for a communication of them, whenever it should prove convenient.[8]

The idea of those Gentlemen, that the poem is Allegorical, is so far from a foundation, that, untill [*sic*][9] I received your letter, it never entered into my mind, that such an apprehension could be entertained by a man of common sense. Singular jealousy of American resentment, & perhaps a strong consciousness, that the Opressive Measures of Britain[10] wore a striking similarity to the Egyptian abuse, must have originated[11] this view of the Poem. In several particular incidents referred to, especially in the colloquy of the first book,[12] there is, I confess, a considerable resemblance between the case of the Israelites, & that of the Americans; & the feelings of the writer may have naturally coloured them into a resemblance still nearer. But I presume the Reviewers must have thot the writer destitute of every[13] Critical idea, to have imagined the *Conquest* of a country a proper event, under which to allegorize the *defence* of another country.

That General Washington should be supposed to resemble Joshua is not strange. They are both great & good Characters, acting at the head of armies, & regulating the chief interests of their countrymen. Between such men in such circumstances a resemblance is almost necessary. But the Character of Joshua was contrived, &, in the essentials, written before the war between Great B. & America commenced.[14]

The truth is, the poem was begun, in the year 1771, & written out, several times, before

[4] *American Magazine*, p. 563.
[5] *European Magazine*, XIII, 175-178; 266-273.
[6] *American Magazine*, p. 565.
[7] See *ibid.*, pp. 563-564.
[8] This first paragraph does not appear in the letter as printed in the *American Magazine*. See *ibid.*, p. 563.
[9] "Untill" is spelled "until" in the letter as printed in the *American Magazine*. Here nouns and adjectives are not capitalized neither are *and's* abbreviated as in the manuscript.
[10] After "Britain," "B" is crossed out in the manuscript.
[11] Before "originated" "O[?]" is crossed out in the manuscript.
[12] Dwight refers here to the "colloquy" between Joshua and Hanniel. See Dwight, *The Conquest of Canäan*, Hartford, 1785, pp. 5-24. See also *European Magazine*, XIII, 177-178.
[13] After "every," "ad" is crossed out in the manuscript.
[14] This sentence is omitted in the letter as printed in the *American Magazine*.

the year 1775;[18] & the last hand, except the addition of the third & fifth books (which were rather added, as the amusement of care & melancholy, than as necessary parts of the poem) & a short passage or two in[19] three of the others) [*sic*] put to it, in the month of Aug[t] 1777.[17] All the essential parts were finished, before the war began, & the poem advertised for the press, during[18] the first year of the war.[20] From these facts, sir, you will perceive the impossibility of any foundation for the conjecture of the Reviewers.[20] To this might be justly added, were it not unnecessary, the improbability, that a Youth of 19 should conceive & execute so tedious & unpleasing a task, as an Allegory of such extent. When the poem was begun, I was but little more than 19 years old, & but 25, when it was finished; & these are periods of human life, when works of such a kind must be singularly dull & uninteresting.

The truth is, the preface to the Poem is an account of it perfectly just, as far I know how to give a just account.

That I should be treated with malignity is not to be wondered at; & that I should be treated with malignity in England is[21] no more than that I should share the common lot of Americans.

I should have sooner answered your first & second letters; but I intended to inclose some little matters for your magazine. Hurry of business & want of sight have however prevented. I wish you success in the publication; & think, if the public should encourage it, you may contribute much to the pleasure & advantage of our countrymen. I beg you to consider me as a subscriber. The terms I do not at present remember, but will comply with them, as soon as I see them.

A hymn, sung at the public exhibitions of the Scholars, belonging to the Academy in Greenfield, on May 2[d], 1788, accompanies this. You will publish it, or not, as you please.[22] It is the only article, I have, at present, copied off. Hereafter I may communicate something of more consequence.

I am under obligation to Mr. Carey the publisher of the Museum.[23] Whenever I forward any poetical performances to you hereafter, I will[24] thank you to copy them, & to transmit one of the copies to him. With much esteem & affection I am, dear sir, your very obliged & most obedient servant

M[r] Webster Timothy Dwight.[25]

[18] After "1775," the rest of this sentence does not appear in the letter as printed in the *American Magazine*.

[19] After "in," "som"[?] is crossed out in the manuscript.

[17] For one of these passages concerning Hale and Major André, see Dwight, *The Conquest of Canäan*, pp. 3-4, ll. 75-92. Note also *ibid.*, p. 3, footnote. Here Dwight remarks: "The comparisons of this kind were all written in the early stages of the late war, and annexed to the poem to indulge the Author's own emotions of regard to the persons named in them. . . ."

[18] Before "during," "the" is crossed out in the manuscript.

[20] See *The Connecticut Courant and Weekly Intelligencer*, Hartford, Connecticut, Monday, March 18, 1776, p. 3, column 3. These proposals for printing the poem by subscription were:

> "I. This work will be contained in twelve sheets, making upwards of 950 pages, mo.
> II. . . . at the price of one dollar.
> III. Those who subscribe for a dozen shall have a thirteenth gratis."

Mr. Victor Hugo Paltsits, of the New York Public Library, informs me that Nathan Hale endeavored, in 1776, to secure subscribers to *The Conquest of Canäan*.

[20] Here the letter as printed in the *American Magazine* ends.

[21] After "is," "to be" is crossed out in the manuscript.

[22] This poem was printed in the *American Magazine* for June, 1788. See *ibid.*, pp. 507-508.

[23] Mathew Carey (1760-1839) was an Irish-American writer, publisher, and bookseller.

[24] After "will," a second "will" appears in the manuscript.

[25] This letter is addressed to "Noah Webster Esquire, Mr. Dunlap, New York" and is endorsed in Webster's [?] hand: "M[r] Dwight Greenfield June 6 1788."

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

I. Dissertations on Individual Authors:

Fanny Kemble Butler. Mrs. Leota S. Driver. Vanderbilt.
William Byrd, II, of Virginia. R. C. Beatty. Vanderbilt.
Dante in American Literature. J. C. Mathews. Duke.
Emerson in England. T. Scudder, III. Yale.
Joel Chandler Harris. P. M. Cousins. Columbia.
Hawthorne as a Thinker. E. L. Crowell. Wisconsin.
Paul Hamilton Hayne. C. R. Anderson. Columbia. (E. L. Johnson has relinquished this subject.)
John Howard Payne. ————. Harvard.
James Ralph. R. W. Kenny. Brown.
R. H. Stoddard. H. L. Shaw, Jr. New York University.
Roger Williams. S. H. Brockunier. Harvard (history department).

II. Dissertations on Topics of a General Nature:

Studies in the Periodicals of Transcendentalism. Clarence Gohdes. Columbia.

III. Research not Previously Reported as Completed:

Outlines of the Literary History of Colonial Pennsylvania. M. Katherine Jackson. Columbia. 1906. Lancaster, Pa.
Augustus Baldwin Longstreet. John D. Wade. Columbia. 1923. Macmillan.

IV. Other Research in Progress:

Robert S. Forsythe (North Dakota). Melville (critical introductions to *Pierre* and *The Bell Tower*); Life, Literary Work, and Ideas of Fenimore Cooper.
G. E. Jensen (Connecticut College). Life and Letter of H. C. Bunner.
A. W. Peach (Norwich). Thomas Paine; Rowland Robinson.

Titles of all approved subjects for doctor's dissertations should be sent to

ERNEST E. LEISY
Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Beginning with November, 1929, each number of AMERICAN LITERATURE will contain a list of articles on American literature published in other periodicals. Book reviews will not be included. A very brief descriptive (not critical) summary of each important article will be given. The names of those periodicals covered in our list will be given so that investigators may know exactly what is included in the bibliography. The Editors will welcome reprints or other information concerning articles appearing in other periodicals than those covered in our list.

Miss Isadore Mudge, of the Columbia University Library, has kindly agreed to prepare for our use lists of published bibliographies in the general field of American literature.

THE EDITORS.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Leaf of Grass from Shady Hill: *With a review of Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass.* Written by Charles Eliot Norton in 1855. Edited by Kenneth B. Murdock. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard University Press. 1928. 32 pp.

Walt Whitman's Workshop: *A Collection of Unpublished Manuscripts.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Clifton Joseph Furness. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard University Press, 1928. xiv + 266 pp.

The last half a dozen years have witnessed a marked reawakening of scholarly interest in Walt Whitman and the problems presented by his life and work. That this interest is not on the wane is indicated by the publication recently of two new books about Whitman by the Harvard University Press.

The first of these in order of publication is a slender but sumptuous volume entitled *A Leaf of Grass from Shady Hill*, in which Professor Kenneth B. Murdock, as editor, has brought together a hitherto unpublished poem by Charles Eliot Norton written under the inspiration of Whitman and a review of *Leaves of Grass* published anonymously by Professor Norton in *Putnam's Magazine* for September, 1855. Professor Norton's poem, though it is without the vigor and rudeness of Whitman, reveals nevertheless in matter and form and spirit a finely sympathetic understanding of the poet's methods and aims. And the review, written within a few weeks after the publication of *Leaves of Grass*, furnishes the gratifying revelation that not all Cantabrigians were unmindful of Whitman's power and significance at the beginning of his career. For although Norton condemns frankly the grossness of *Leaves of Grass* and complains also of the poet's slanginess and conceit, which he says sometimes verge on the ludicrous, he also finds in the poem, which he aptly characterizes as "a compound of the New England transcendentalist and New York rowdy," "an original perception of nature, a manly brawn, and an epic directness . . . which belongs to no other adept of the transcendental school," and he maintains that the poem, despite its imperfections, is an "elevated" and "profound" and "somehow fascinating book."

Professor Murdock, in a gracefully written introduction of twenty pages, presents the case for Norton's authorship of the poem and of the review, the authenticity of which he establishes beyond any peradventure, and also comments upon Norton's understanding of Whitman as revealed both in the poem and in the review, and on his attitude to Whitman in subsequent years. In the course of his observations he prints a highly interesting letter of Norton's, of September 23, 1855, to Lowell, in which Norton records much the same estimate of Whitman as appears in his

review, and in the same connection he gives Lowell's letter in reply in which the Cambridge poet emphatically places himself in the opposite camp.

The other volume, happily entitled *Walt Whitman's Workshop*, is a stout quarto of nearly three hundred pages, in which Mr. Clifton J. Furness collects a substantial body of by no means unimportant Whitman material not heretofore published or collected, and on the basis of this inquires into the poet's habits of thought and, in particular, into his methods as craftsman during the heyday of his literary career. This new material consists of sundry notes by Whitman on the general subject of lecturing or on lectures that he had projected; a series of more or less scattering observations, jotted down apparently for use in newspaper articles, on the subject of slavery; a pamphlet, preserved in proof-sheets, entitled *The Eighteenth Presidency*, written as a campaign document in behalf of Frémont's candidacy in 1856; a series of introductions (with variant readings) intended for American editions of *Leaves of Grass* and an introduction also for a London edition; besides numerous brief manuscripts and other miscellaneous notes illustrating or otherwise elucidating the major items. The bulk of this material is from the Whitman collection generously placed by Thomas B. Harned in the Library of Congress; other important items are from the collection of Mr. Oscar Lion of New York City; and one is from the J. Pierpont Morgan Library.

The volume is supplied with a general introduction in which Mr. Furness details the circumstances that gave rise to each of the items that he collects and remarks on their significance for the evolution of Whitman's art; and each of the several items is prefaced by a statement tracing its history and commenting on its peculiar importance. In an Appendix running to nearly one hundred pages and comprising some three hundred notes, all told, Mr. Furness enters into a minuter commentary on each of these items, and shows their relation in detail to other writings of Whitman as well as their bearing on his biography.

Of the documents now first given to the world the most valuable, as it seems to me, is the political pamphlet on *The Eighteenth Presidency*, which has the effect of showing as never before how profoundly Whitman was stirred up over the abolition movement and its exciting causes; but of extraordinary interest also are Whitman's notes on lectures and lecturing—most of them crude and incondite, to be sure—and the several drafts of prefaces written by the poet for one or another of the editions of *Leaves of Grass*, but presently mislaid, not to be found again until after his death. Valuable also are the portraits and facsimiles, most of them here given for the first time, with which the volume is embellished.

In numerous general observations made here and there throughout the volume Mr. Furness ranges virtually over the entire field of Whitman criticism, and the judgments that he arrives at seem to me to be almost

invariably well-reasoned and sound. He asserts, for instance (on page 8),—and the point has been too often overlooked or ignored,—that Whitman's "purpose, as he perceived it, . . . was at bottom a religious rather than a literary one," that he was guided by what he conceived to be a "message" religious in nature. He rejects, with obvious correctness, the charge that Whitman was an atheist or essentially irreligious. Recognizing the "semi-articulate" nature, in its earlier stages, of much that Whitman wrote, he maintains—here also quite justly, I believe—that to Whitman "the business of literary expression was . . . always a work, rather than an art,"—that he labored as a literary mechanic. Again he asserts that the poet's interest in lecturing and his aspirations and experimenting in that direction played an important part in the development of his genius. And here, also, I believe him to be right, though his statement (page 11) that his interest in public speaking had "an even more vital connection with the form in which his ideas eventually cast themselves than had the lyceum lectures of Emerson with that author's published essays" is, to say the least, debatable. I wonder, too, whether, in his sympathy for Whitman, he does not overstate the case for his hero when he apologizes (page 199) for Whitman's "self-puffery" in certain of his early reviews of *Leaves of Grass*. The fact that this was in accord with a fashion of the day hardly furnishes an adequate excuse for the poet's derelictions in this regard. And his method of criss-crossing in his references to his notes is, to me, somewhat disconcerting.

But these are small matters, and it would be ungrateful to dwell on them in appraising a book in which so much has been accomplished. Mr. Furness has placed every student of Whitman under abiding obligation to him.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

The University of Texas.

AMERICAN CRITICISM: *Studies in Literary Theory from Poe to the Present.* By Norman Foerster. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1928.

I

Whether one thinks of a sound scholarly exegesis of the critical creeds of Poe, Emerson, Lowell, and Whitman, or of an original analysis and evaluation of those creeds, *American Criticism* is by all odds the most valuable existing treatment of its subject. Professor Foerster's work is distinctive in its combination of purposeful and thorough scholarship, balance and comprehensiveness, a power of correlating American with European thought, and a profoundly discriminating consideration of ultimate values. His sketch of the critical method of the humanist, found in the conclusion, enables us to watch him practice his own method. He will first seek "historical understanding," second, "the understanding born of

sympathy," and third, a "judgment of the book's value." Before one allows oneself to be prejudiced by the label "humanist," one should ask whether, after all, the method outlined is not essentially a sane, practicable, comprehensive synthesis of what is admirable in the method of historical scholarship, modern impressionism, and classical or judicial criticism. At any rate, it is a method which equally avoids the academic heresy of "facts for facts' sake," the impressionistic heresy of "art for art's sake," and the harsh application of judicial yardsticks without understanding or sympathy.

II

Perhaps the best preface for a discussion of *American Criticism* will be an attempt to indicate briefly the main trend of three of the essays.

Emerson's apparently harsh judgments seem justifiable when one considers his "absolute criticism" based on criteria derived from supreme art and his important doctrine of the unity and parity of beauty, truth, and goodness—a doctrine which gives his dictum that "art is the creation of beauty" a breadth and depth and humanity foreign to Poe. To quote Professor Foerster's own summary: "Using things as symbols, the artist combines them in new forms to express his intuition of eternal beauty. All great art is organic (the outer depending on the inner), in two senses. 1. From the organism, the intuition, itself, proceeds the appropriate form that expresses it. 2. And the intuition, or thing expressed, likewise proceeds from a reality beyond the artist's understanding. We say that the artist aims to express ideal beauty, but we mean that he lets it express itself through him." Emerson's recognition of the "need of a principle of restraint in inspiration as the credential of its quality" suggests a Platonic rather than a romantic derivation. His self-reliance is not so much a romantic praise of individual idiosyncrasy as "obedience to the genius or immanent universal." Although "German thought is highly important in Emerson, . . . Platonism is truly even more important." Even when allowance is made for his romantic traits, "the main current of Emerson's mind was not the romantic but the classic," as indicated by his Platonic synthesis of beauty, truth, and goodness, his doctrines of organic art, of insight, universality, centrality, poise, and dualism. As regards literary criticism, the main weakness of "the friend and aider of those who would live in the spirit" is found to be his relative indifference to the specific province of literature, that is the plane between that of the natural and the supernatural—the human plane of men's "actions, thoughts, sensations, passions."

Despite the impression of "superficiality and futility," Professor Foerster finds Lowell America's "most distinguished literary critic," whose "really distinct and impressive" criteria have been unjustly ignored. An impartial survey of all the evidence as to his critical method shows that it "involves sensitiveness to impressions, historical understanding, and an æsthetic-

ethical judgment." Blending the classic and the romantic, Lowell—unlike Poe—accepted the doctrine of organic expression and required an ideality consisting of the normal, the typical, and the human, an ideality which "uses the actual by drawing upon it in order to envisage and represent types of human nature." While he distinguished between three varieties of the imagination—the spiritual or intuitive; the plastic or shaping; and the expressive or detail-creating—he required that the imagination should be balanced by reason, and he required excellence of form as a necessary basis for the highest merit: ethical or spiritual insight. "The function of art," in summary, "is to give delight. Of delight there are two general grades: first, the delight of recreation. . . ; and secondly, the joyful exercise of higher faculties, or perhaps of all the faculties of the mind and spirit working in harmony and so producing happiness rather than mere pleasure." Lowell's creed is said to be our "sanest and most comprehensive conception of literature . . . prior to the twentieth century," "almost the unwritten constitution of the republic of letters." The impression of superficiality and futility is credited to Lowell's lack of self-mastery, his inability to focus and reconcile his brilliant but scattered thoughts; he lived between senescent romanticism and nascent science. "Head and heart, reason and imagination, classic and romantic, ancients and moderns, aristocracy and democracy, humanism and humanitarianism, religion and science, were engaged in inconclusive warfare within him."

"Never properly recognized" as a literary critic, Whitman "was far better equipped for his task than has been ordinarily realized." A summary of his vast reading indicates that his boundless receptivity extended to the literature of the past, "to the two ancient traditions, the Greek and the Hebraic, and the two newer traditions, the feudal and the democratic." Yet he constantly prophesied a "superior literature, the product of Democracy and Science," since "great literature is an organic expression of its age and nation," dominated by an "ethical and spiritual purpose." Seeking our "æsthetic and religious independence," he believed that our democratic national spirit, nurtured by the boundless West, would determine a literature which should be based on the common and average man, the people, as well as upon a "rich, luxuriant, varied personalism." A new vision of man, he thought, was suggested by "Science, which is faith in nature, belief in the glory of the physical." "Yet physical reality will be meaningless unless touched by mind and soul. Thus the ideal future American will be determined by the average, the physical, the divine, and he will unite pride and expansive sympathy. Having sought to "understand what it was he believed," having "refrained . . . from criticism of its validity," Professor Foerster concludes with a judicial analysis showing that Whitman side-stepped the true aim of literary criticism in seeking "accurate forecast" rather than a "determination of sound principles of writing." At any rate, his prophecy has been "falsified by the

event": instead of the democratic-scientific-optimistic-religious art which Whitman predicted, science has given us skepticism, disillusionment, cynicism and determinism which has "robbed life of purpose and even of adventure"; and democracy has given us mainly equalitarianism and standardization. Whitman, finally, was really not the first of the moderns but the last "European romanticist modified by the American environment." Whereas he was a mystic realist, modern realists accept only the determination of biology, economics, and psychology.

III

In relation to the outstanding merit which even such a brief and imperfect summary discloses, minor adverse comments are insignificant indeed. Nevertheless, a few might be made.

(1) Some readers may be a bit disappointed to find in a book called *American Criticism* scarcely any mention of James and the idealists (Mr. Walden's index omits what mention is made), and only cursory mention of realists such as Howells and Garland. One would like to see, also, a few pages on such men as Thoreau, Burroughs, or even Longfellow.

(2) The expectation that a humanist in discussing nineteenth century critics will display inadequate sympathy is fulfilled only once, so far as I am aware: Has not a lack of sympathy perhaps unconsciously motivated a disproportionate emphasis—half the essay—on Poe's unsound notions of ideality and Arcadianism? What is said the evidence justifies, and the analysis is keen; but might not Poe's admirable contributions to technique and form, which have had far more influence and importance than his Arcadianism, justify a somewhat more favorable emphasis?

(3) One hesitates to take issue with such a distinguished stylist and organizer as Professor Foerster, but the reviewer wonders whether the inconsistency of method and structure of the four essays may not occasionally confuse careless readers as to whether they are reading an elucidation of the critic's views or the author's comment. Clear, logical, forceful, the essay on Whitman impartially interprets his views *before* "criticism of their validity" is begun. Would not this method applied to Poe, Emerson, and Lowell prevent any confusion—infrequent and slight as it may be—which may arise from an intermingling of the critic's ideas and the author's comment?

(4) While the incisive elucidation of Emerson's classical leanings is certainly praiseworthy, one wonders whether, in concluding that "the main current of Emerson's mind was not the romantic but the classic," due regard is given his optimism, his faith in natural goodness, his placid assumption of good intentions, and the extent to which these tenets furnished philosophic sanction for economic *laissez-faire* and an unbridled materialism which, boomerang-like, has finally come full circle to crush the very idealism Emerson preached. We remember that even his dear friend, C. E. Norton, concluded:

> Such inveterate and persistent optimism . . . degenerates into fatalistic indifference to moral considerations, and to personal responsibilities; it is at the root of much of the irrational sentimentalism in our politics, of much of our national disregard for honor in our public men, of much of our unwillingness to accept hard truths, and of much of the common tendency to disregard the distinctions between right and wrong, and to excuse guilt on the plea of good intentions or good nature.[1]

(5) Finally, the omission—for the most part—of page references forces the reader to accept somewhat blindly the good faith of the author in considering the evolutionary sequence of the critics' ideas, and whether the context of a statement justifies its extraction as evidence to be used in a general sense. The men here dealt with, it is true, did not much modify their views as they grew older, and where chronology is especially relevant, dates have usually been indicated. Of course the full indices of the editions of Poe, Lowell, and Emerson offer some aid in checking up. The reviewer once had occasion to make a card-index to Lowell's criticism of romantic literature, and a checking of the Lowell essay enables him to testify to Professor Foerster's rare thoroughness and fairness. In the case, however, of a scholar less thorough and respected, the omission of page references would be, I think, undesirable.

IV

I have no wish, however, to emphasize such minor points. Among the rare merits of the book, one should not overlook the effectiveness of the inductive presentation of evidence in making the author's conclusions convincing. His conclusions are not simply statements of personal opinions, but rather carefully formed generalizations based squarely on facts, first presented fully and sympathetically. Furthermore, *American Criticism* is not merely a competent summary of critical views, not merely a technical treatise for the specialist: it is above all a book filled with penetrating discussions of all sorts of vital human problems by a man exceptionally wise, well-read, and well-poised, a man who values books essentially as guides to conduct and to happiness. The scholar's weakness for out-of-the-way information, for the merely curious, is subordinated to stress on what is of truly universal and lasting interest and value. Among specific merits, among relatively original contributions, mention might be made of the following:

(1) The precise definition of the quality of Poe's indeterminate ideality ending in restless melancholy helps us to see Poe more clearly in relation to the Romantic movement. This sort of aspiration is contrasted with the aspiration of the Christian who finds his rest and peace in the divine, and with the aspiration of the humanists who find happiness in the typically human.

(2) The important, little-known evidence of Lowell's stress on historical criticism, of his humanistic criteria, of his conception of the hu-

[1] *Letters of C. E. Norton* (Boston, 1913), I, 504 ff.

manistic imagination, easily refutes the unfair and one-sided *James Russell Lowell as a Critic* by J. J. Reilly, who concludes that to call him anything more than an "appreciator" is to do him the "injustice of over-estimation." (p. 214.)

(3) A valuable service has been rendered in elucidating Emerson's doctrine of organic expression; the surprising meaning of "Beauty is its own excuse for being" in relation to a triune beauty, truth, and goodness; and the conservative classical elements apparent, when one balances, for example, Emerson's doctrine of inspiration with the passage on the "Internal Check," or the doctrine of self-reliance with the *Over-Soul* teaching of reliance on "man's share of divinity."

(4) New light has been thrown on Whitman's reading and his reliance on the past, as well as the influence of science—a much neglected influence upon American thought.[2]

(5) Attention is called to the significance of the varying attitudes toward the relation between music and literature held by Poe, Emerson, and Whitman. On this subject the views of Thoreau also would be of interest.

(6) The valuable, compact, comprehensive, and discriminating summaries of the critics' creeds (pp. 6, 59, 146, 170), and the succinct outline of the humanistic doctrine (pp. 236-256), enable the reader to get the main points quickly and surely. The creed-summaries, it should be noted, are uncolored by humanism, and therefore the most hostile anti-humanist should be able to use them and appreciate their merit.

(7) Here at last is a humanist who "recognizes, indeed, the services of naturism" (as listed on p. 237), and the merits of historical and impressionistic criticism (pp. 252-254).

(8) Professor Foerster has no futilitarian attitude toward the present, no ineffectual longing to escape the present in the blind worship of any past. Recognizing that "through continuity and revivalism, the past is inescapable," he suggests that our present difficulties may be in part the heritage of the past we are now using—which extends only to the mid-seventeenth century—and he optimistically urges an "integration, the establishment of a significant relation between the present and the past" of the medieval Christian and classical ages, "to make" (as Arnold said) "an intellectual situation of which the creative power can profitably avail itself."

(9) Many who regard Professor Foerster as the gifted spokesman of the soundest, sanest, and most purposeful tradition in modern American scholarship will welcome his incisive statement of the humanist's assumptions, doctrine, æsthetic, and critical method. Far from representing a strictly modern fad or sect, the "new" humanists—it is evident, I think,—

[2] I have in preparation a study of the influence of science on the thought of Emerson and Holmes.

are simply carrying on, in a somewhat more self-conscious, unified, logical, and militant manner, the most deeply rooted tradition of American culture present in Emerson and Lowell. And Professor Foerster has surely done as much as anyone to advance a humanistic study of American literature today.

HARRY HAYDEN CLARK.

The University of Wisconsin.

THE NOVELIST OF VERMONT: *A Biographical and Critical Study of Daniel Pierce Thompson*. By John E. Flitcroft. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press. 1929.

Although *The Green Mountain Boys* was the most popular romance in the school of Cooper, few readers know the name of its author or anything about him. His work received little critical attention in its own day, and his best known book is now relegated to the shelf of boys' books. Yet the author of a work that passed through fifty editions during its first score years, and which still sells widely, is not without significance in American literary history. Realizing this, Dr. Flitcroft has rehabilitated the eccentric Vermont lawyer-novelist. He has placed Thompson against his Montpelier background, and has furnished an analysis of his works.

It appears that the author of *The Green Mountain Boys* was himself a romantic character. "He always walked with a preoccupied air in the middle of the road. If he were going fishing, he would carry a long bamboo pole over his shoulder, wear his overalls with one suspender attached, one leg drawn over his boot, and the other inside; he would wear a broad-brimmed straw hat, he would be chewing tobacco, and without looking to the right or left would walk on through the village lost in abstraction. The small boys in the neighborhood would run after him and ask him to tell them stories about the Indians." It is a human portrait that Dr. Flitcroft has produced despite difficulties caused by contradictory local evidence and the destruction of Thompson's papers by fire two years after his death. The narrative traces the author's life from the time of his birth in the shadow of Bunker Hill twelve years after the Revolution, through the migration of the family to what was then a Northern frontier; relates a memorable visit to Jefferson at Monticello; and considers his subsequent career as lawyer, editor, and author.

Though Thompson's fame rests on his having shaped the Ethan Allen saga into permanent literary form at the psychological time, he has further claims upon the student's attention. He made two other excursions into historical romance. In *The Rangers* he furnished a sequel to *The Green Mountain Boys*, and in *The Doomed Chief* he dealt with King Philip's War, then a popular subject of romance. Two tales of adventure, *May Martin* and *Gaut Gurley*, belong, in my opinion, to the "forest and

stream" tendency of the fiction of the day, and *Locke Amsden*, probably the author's best book, was a forerunner, though perhaps not an influence upon, *The Hoosier Schoolmaster*. *The Honest Lawyer*, in its half finished form, is printed here for the first time. It concerns a changeling and the familiar motif of a disputed title to land, and is neither better nor worse than the others. Thompson, it is evident, was a born story-teller, but an imperfectly trained one.

Dr. Flitcroft's dissertation, in common with many others, is somewhat weak in references. Had he read some of the less well-known novels of Cooper, he might have connected *The Rangers* with *The Satanstoe and The Doomed Chief* with *The Wept of Wish-ton-Wish*, not to mention Hollister's *Mount Hope*. The Jane McRae legend was more widely diffused in American fiction than he suspects. The reviews of *The Green Mountain Boys* were few, but he has overlooked one in *Knickerbocker's Magazine* (XV, 254) of more importance than the one he quotes (page 92). On page 109 he mistakenly alludes to Kennedy's novel of the Revolution as having its setting in Maryland instead of in the Carolinas. It seems to me that in his desire not to seem too enthusiastic he has perhaps underestimated Thompson's originality. The novelist's humanized portraits of Ethan Allen, St. Clair, Benedict Arnold, and others, mark a distinct advance upon the cold and shadowy portraitures of Cooper's Washington and Paul Jones. Thompson gathered his information from eyewitnesses, and, instead of following the models of previous historical novelists, related as romantic history his indomitable kinsmen's defense of home. Whatever scruples orthodox readers may have had about a novel with the author of *The Oracles of Reason* for its hero seem to have dissolved under the spell of Thompson's vigorous narrative and the appeal of an American Wat Tyler or Robin Hood. On the whole, however, Dr. Flitcroft's book is characterized by just and sensible criticism. The appendix contains a valuable, hitherto unpublished lecture on American romances, and there is an excellent bibliography.

Ernest E. Leisy.

Southern Methodist University.

Witchcraft in Old and New England. By George Lyman Kittredge. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press. 1929.

To analyze an individual like Cotton Mather or Samuel Sewall or a phenomenon like the witchcraft delusion in Salem as a thing apart, a provincial product to be examined only in its home environment, has been all too often the method of historians and biographers. Modern scholarship more and more is broadening the field of its research and is grubbing for roots instead of pausing at individual outcroppings. Professor Kittredge, instead of remaining in old Salem and collecting a vol-

ume of facts and conclusions concerning the curious outburst of superstition which for a time created a reign of terror in the Boston area, leaves America entirely and approaches the matter from the standpoint of the whole history of witchcraft persecution in the Anglo-Saxon world and even beyond it. Beginning with the fundamental statement that "belief in witchcraft is the common heritage of humanity," he traces the history of witchcraft outbreaks to the seventeenth century and then proves beyond dispute that "to believe in witchcraft was practically universal in the seventeenth century, even among the educated; with the mass of the people it was absolutely universal." In carefully documented chapters he presents the various phases of the delusion: "Image Magic and the Like," "Madness, Curses, and the Elfshot," "Venefica," "Charms Ghoulish and Profane," "Wind and Weather," "The Witch in the Dairy," "Treasure Trove," "Haunted Houses and Haunted Men," "The Seer," "The Compact and the Witches' Sabbath," and the like.

Viewed from the whole history of witchcraft the Salem prosecutions and executions seem too trivial almost for record. The author's treatment of it occupies less than 30 pages of the total 640 of his volume. As one reads one begins to realize that it was not a unique phenomenon, that it was a thing to be expected, that it was but a tiny dribble of contemporary horror from Europe.

> The total number of victims in Massachusetts from the first settlement to the end of the seventeenth century was, as we have seen, twenty-eight—or thirty-four for the whole of New England. Compare the following figures, taken from the annals of Great Britain and Scotland alone. In 1612, ten witches were executed belonging to a single district of Lancashire. In 1645 twenty-nine were condemned at once in a single hundred in Essex.

And so on and on for several pages.

> Matthew Hopkins, the Witchfinder General, brought at least two hundred to the gallows from 1645 to 1647. In Scotland the number of victims was much larger. The most conscientiously moderate estimate makes out a total of at least 3,400 between the years 1580 and 1680. On the Continent many thousands suffered death in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mannhardt reckons the victims from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century at millions, and half a million is thought to be a moderate estimate.

The record of New England, therefore, "is highly creditable when considered as a whole and from the comparative point of view." At several points the findings of the author are revolutionary. The chapter entitled "King James the First" clearly frees the old Scotch sovereign of the charge generally made that his reign was a "dark and bloody period." Again he proves conclusively that the "tenets of the New Englanders in the matter of witchcraft are not to be ascribed to something peculiar about their religious opinions—to what is loosely called their Puritan theology."

The book easily takes its place as the leading authority on its subject. The amount of work expended by the author upon the making of it is little short of amazing. The notes alone, with their bibliographical con-

tent and their excerpts from the records of hundred of cases, fill two hundred and twenty-three pages. It was a work that was needed: it lightens decidedly a hitherto dim area in our colonial history.

FRED LEWIS PATTEE.

Rollins College.

HERMAN MELVILLE. By Lewis Mumford. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1929. $3.75.

There are many things to be thankful for in Lewis Mumford's *Herman Melville*: for example, the author does not try to raise himself to a literary intimacy with his subject by calling him "Herman," and that is a true source of satisfaction to the readers of American biography who must have had their fill of condescending references in modern volumes to "Nathaniel" and "Edgar" and "Henry" and the rest. Further, the book takes a tone of warm poetic feeling, not always, but commonly, well sustained. In careful analysis and casual allusion, the biographer demonstrates that he knows substantially all that there is to know in the way of fact about Melville and his work. Consequently, a reviewer may safely give his attention to matters of emphasis and interpretation. Here is the program in brief:

> The exotic elements in Melville's experience have usually been overstressed; the fatality and completeness of his withdrawal from the contemporary scene have been exaggerated; the incidental rocks and rapids and whirlpools have diverted the critic's attention from the flow of the stream itself. It is with Herman Melville's strength and energy on the spiritual plane that I shall chiefly deal.

Of the three parts into which the narrative is divided, the first two ("Olympian" and "Titan") are far the more significant to a reader in quest of Melville, while the third part ("Pilgrim") is the center of interest to those who seek Mumford. One may as well admit that such men as Lewis Mumford and Van Wyck Brooks can by their very nature only imperfectly assume the rôle of biographer. Their medium of expression is rather more subjective than objective, more creative than critical; perhaps in the present volume one may say that the heightened poetic strain sometimes calls attention off the object to itself. Mumford becomes finally more incandescent than Melville, and there results the troubled impression that somehow horses have been changed mid-stream. But a writer need surely be endowed with the poet's insight to interpret Melville at all adequately; more than that, the writer need be a poet of the same general temper as Melville—who, as Mumford amply shows, is almost altogether poet, a poet of very different sort from Mumford.

At any rate, it is safe to affirm that the great section of the book—the chapters on *Moby Dick*, and on *Pierre*—constitutes the most complete, eloquent, and inescapable writing that has so far been done upon Melville. The only fault to find is that possibly *Moby Dick* has been over-

emphasized at the expense of Melville's other genuinely fine books, particularly *Pierre*, though the latter is treated notably if somewhat adversely. The impression left by many other sections of the book is not nearly so satisfying. In dealing with "Herman Melville's strength and energy on the spiritual plane"; that is, in integrating his picture as a whole (the most important concern of this biography) Lewis Mumford appears to be hardly successful.

That Melville is a rebel, defiant of his own time and place, in almost every utterance from *Typee* to *White Jacket* to *Moby Dick*, is properly brought out here as in Weaver's book and elsewhere; and that in parts of *Moby Dick*, in *Pierre*, in *The Confidence Man*, he becomes more the unmitigated pessimist and even the misanthrope than the rebel or the reformer, is also made admirably apparent. At this point, Mumford finds Melville growing intolerable on his hands, as we may take the liberty of guessing; for the latter third of the book affords an important clue to Mumford (a man well worth studying for his own sake, if only one were not just now so immersed in Melville) in the gallant and strenuous attempt there made to Mumfordize Melville's mystery. Lewis Mumford seems to be a man—as men go—well integrated, at one with himself, inveterately courageous and hopeful. He accordingly seizes upon those long final years of Melville's life, expressed mainly in *Clarel* and *Billy Budd*, and moulds them to his will. The student of *Clarel* and *Billy Budd*, attacking them with no special prepossessions, can with difficulty appreciate Mumford's reading of Melville's later spiritual phases. In brief, the biographer holds that Melville rehabilitated himself psychically during the last thirty or forty years of his life, when the bulk of his writing had been finished. Now, resting upon all the evidence submitted by Mumford, it would seem hard to imagine a better example than the later Melville affords of a man who has resigned himself rather reluctantly to live through and live out a somewhat weary and de-vitalized existence. That Melville's tame occupation and that the slightly ameliorated tone of *Clarel* or *Billy Budd* indicate an energetic spiritual re-integration rather than a general flagging of physical and spiritual vigor is wholly unproved and far from plausible. In so far as this theory is made appealing it comes to pass by reason of Lewis Mumford's unspent spiritual energies: we get a chapter in Mumford's Autobiography rather than one in Melville's Biography.

To make clearer my point, I shall quote a representative passage from the first half of the book, where Mumford seems wholly immersed in Melville; then a passage from the conclusion where Melville seems to be transubstantiated into Mumford.

> The scene is now set: the struggle in which Melville is to participate is defined. It is a struggle between a plastic, conventional self, moulded in the fashion of his fellow citizens and fellow writers, and a hard, defiant, adamantine self that springs out of his deepest consciousness of life, and is ready to assault, not merely human conventions, but the high gods themselves.

Melville is, then, as Mumford later explicitly states, the speaker of the Everlasting Nay, *par excellence*. On next to the last page, we find that, out of his own abounding personality, Lewis Mumford has created a more congenial Herman Melville.

> The stripping down of Herman Melville's ego, which he began in *Mardi* and finished in *Pierre*, was a sloughing away of labels, nicknames, party war-cries, habits, conventions, and acceptances; it was, necessarily, a prelude to that building up of a new ego, a surer and more central, a social and participating self, which is the task of our own time for both men and communities. Melville was crippled in the work of re-construction by a hiatus in his own career, which was followed and made final by the social hiatus of the Civil War: though he sought to carry the work further in *Clarel*, one cannot pretend that he did anything but give a hint of this mended psyche, this more richly integrated self. . . .

The "hint" was enough for this biographer; less inspired readers may well find it quite impalpable.

While it is not very profitable to list the things that one wishes a biographer had seen fit to do, such a list may not be altogether useless. About Hawthorne and Melville. Why need Mumford follow the rest in assuming that Hawthorne was so abysmally lacking? Above all, why need he gratuitously present us with the incredible notion that "Ethan Brand" was Hawthorne's picture of Melville![1] Be it, however, credited to Mumford that he did write the following sentence:

> Yet there was something fine and true between these two men—if only there had not been the reserve and the distance between them, a reserve that Melville's old rollicking ways and easy gipsy friendliness could not break down.

About the reception of Melville's successive books. Though the biography contains excerpts from reviews, here and there, one is never made to feel strongly the *decrescendo* in the reception of the successive volumes from *Typee* to *Pierre*,—a matter that Melville himself must have felt crushingly.

About the New England tradition as it entangled and paralyzed Melville both from without and from within. There are spots where this book seems on the verge of grappling with that question, but it never does. After all, what more positive force conditions *Moby Dick* and *Pierre* than Melville's reaction to New Englandism?

JOHN BROOKS MOORE.

The University of Michigan.

GEORGE W. CABLE: HIS LIFE AND LETTERS. By his Daughter, Lucy Leffingwell Cable Biklé. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1928. xiii + 306 pp. $3.50.

This biography of George W. Cable by his daughter, Mrs. Biklé, deserves a high place among "family" biographies. The work is frankly not

[1] See Randall Stewart's "Ethan Brand," *The Saturday Review of Literature*, April 27, 1929, for conclusive proof that Hawthorne could not have been picturing Melville.

critical; Mrs. Biklé edits her father's numerous letters carefully and leaves them to tell the story.

The letters cover chiefly the latter forty years of the author's life. They are eager, enthusiastic, and always interesting even when concerned only with details of family life. Sometimes they are highly amusing, as in the description of Mark Twain at the Helmeth Female College in Toronto. They always reveal a man of charm to whom the more morbid aspects of life are absent rather than submerged.

The many aspects, as well as peculiar character, of Cable's life are emphasized in this volume—facts which one is likely to forget in reading his stories. His later life, with his lecture tours, his connections with practically all of the literary élite of this country and England, his community and garden clubs, his activities in behalf of prison reform (begun long before he had left New Orleans)—these aspects are likely to disconcert a reader of *Old Creole Days*. The gay and pleasant vices of old Creole New Orleans were never an integral part of the man. To be sure he was active in many phases of the city's life, but as a business man, a church worker, a man interested in the respectable cultured life. He was an observer but not a partaker of the life of the Vieux Carré; with him the ugly passions which made the materials of his first stories possible are but the remotest cause.

These letters also reveal something of Cable's own theories of literary production. "Produce the cream and sell that instead of giving your entire life and strength to larger production and mediocre quality" (p. viii) may cause one to wonder if he lived up to his own ideal. At the notion that Cable was conscious of the wide gulf which often separates attractiveness of character in life and in literature—and this feeling must be especially keen to a writer who would have life to be wholly respectable and pious and domestic—is given some strength by his remark on Père Jerome (p. 72): "It was my chagrin over the partial failure with him [Frowenfeld] that determined me to write out a character who should be pious and yet satisfactory to the artistic sense; hence Père Jerome in the story of Madame Delphine."

Looking about to discover some possible cause of the decline shown in Cable's latter work, in the work done after he had left New Orleans, the reviewer in *The Saturday Review of Literature* (Feb. 2, 1929) finds "that it was a misfortune that when once fame came, he shut himself up in a classic New England seclusion, stepping forth but rarely and then as a rather self-conscious literary celebrity. He would have done better to stay in the South and keep himself near the people and the soil which gave him his materials." Possibly. But how was it possible? By this time Cable would have been a self-conscious celebrity in New Orleans, and as to the classic seclusion, there is no indication in his letters that his life was secluded in New England. To be sure, he was geographically remote from his materials, but after all, he had lived forty years with his materials

before going to New England. Most people will admit readily enough that Cable's literary powers dwindled after *Dr. Sevier* (1885) and his mannerisms possessed him, but other causes than this one must be sought—age, security, and possibly diffusion of energies in his "classic seclusion."

F. K. MITCHELL.

Duke University.

THE HEART OF HAWTHORNE'S JOURNALS. Edited by Newton Arvin. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929. xiv + 345 pp.

The service of this volume is to offer to the casual reader of Hawthorne within more convenient limits personal observations and reflections of the novelist, which have, for the most part, been scattered and not always easy of access. In brief, this reader, instead of taking down three or four volumes from his shelves, when he wishes to penetrate behind the formal Hawthorne, need now turn only to one,—this selection of slightly more than three hundred pages, from the thoughts, feelings, and events of about twenty-seven years of Hawthorne's life. He must indeed be a casual reader and believe with passion in the purpose of this series, if he is persuaded that these few flowers can be a substitute for the deep soil of the seventeen manuscript volumes of the journals. Mr. Arvin's excerpts are judicious, but the book is obviously for those who have read, let us say, "Ethan Brand" and *The Scarlet Letter,* and who are inclined to think Mr. Hawthorne, on the whole, an interesting person, and worth an hour's additional browsing.

Naturally, this is a rôle which we all assume at times, and for such reading no book could be more pleasant than Mr. Arvin's. For here in its pages is Mrs. Browning breakfasting with Hawthorne, and chatting of Shakespeare and Margaret Fuller; here is Leigh Hunt, with white hair and musical voice; and here is Hawthorne himself, lamenting the callers who intrude into his domestic paradise, excusing himself blandly from Mr. Emerson's lectures, and paying to Jenny Lind "such compliments as a man could pay who had never heard her sing nor greatly cared to hear her." Here, too, are those characteristic germinal sentences, such as "A ray of sunshine searching for an old blood spot, through a lonely room"; sentences which sometimes reappear like familiar dark threads in the finished weave of tale or novel.

Indeed, if we are content with these desultory matters, the book is admirable, for there is nothing to hinder our agreeable progress through memorabilia of life in England or Italy or through such scenes as the little glen among the golden yellow trees, which was later to reappear in *Tanglewood Tales.* Seldom, as in the companion volume on Emerson, is there a deeply personal confession or an apothegm for the conduct of life. It is hardly too much to say that Professor Perry's *The Heart of Emerson's Journals,* with such passages as those on the dark period of Emerson's

life (1832-1833), has altered somewhat the popular conception of Emerson. Nothing of this sort is to be expected from this book, which from the very nature of Hawthorne's notes is, apart from the external chronicles of his life, a record of the thoughts which he meant to use later in writing fiction. Parts of it are not unlike an artist's palette. Mr. Arvin, therefore, could do little more than repeat for our casual reader the detached observations and reveries of Hawthorne. In giving us the best of these he has done his work well.

Yet shall we not eventually wish far more than this? Mr. Randall Stewart is now editing the American notebooks, aiming to establish from a true text the relation between Hawthorne's first thought of a character and the finished portraiture in the novels. Tracing the development of such ideas through the tales he will be able to describe certain creative processes in Hawthorne's mind. Is this not the real purpose of the notebooks, if they can all be given to the world? But to scholars Mr. Arvin gives little aid, for his additions from the unpublished manuscripts are few and governed by his general purpose of readability. In addition, he often perpetuates the mutilations of the journals by the myth-making Sophia; he shows the connections between the jottings and the tales incompletely; and he sometimes introduces material which is not part of the journals.[1] Most of all, Mr. Arvin's text is corrupt. The collations with the manuscripts are so inaccurately done as to suggest an obvious attitude towards this part of his work. Again we must fall back upon the casual reader; only he will be satisfied with the gist of these important notes. The following passages from the journal kept in the Old Manse, neither better nor worse in accuracy than other parts of the book, are typical of this good-humoured, friendly, readable book. The manuscript reads as follows:

> A rainy day—a rainy day—and I do verily believe there is no sunshine in this world, except what beams from my wife's eyes. At present, she has laid her strict command on me to take pen in hand; and, to ensure my obedience has banished me to the little ten-foot-square apartment, misnamed my study; but she must not be surprised, if the dismalness of the day, and the dulness of my solitude, should be the prominent characteristics of what I write. And what is there to write about at all? Happiness has no succession of events; because it is a part of eternity; and we have been living in eternity, ever since we came to this old Manse. Like Enoch, we seem to have been translated to the other state of being, without having passed through death. Our spirits must have flitted away, unconsciously, in the deep and quiet rapture of some long embrace; and we can only perceive that we have cast off our mortal part, by the more real and earnest life of our spirits.

Mr. Arvin's text reads (p. 90):

> A rainy day—a rainy day—and I do verily believe there is no sunshine in this world, except what beams from my wife's eyes. At present she has laid her strict command on me to take pen in hand, and I am therefore banished to the little ten-foot-square apartment misnamed my study; but perhaps the dismalness of the day and the dulness of my solitude

[1] On page 122 is an excerpt from a letter, without editorial comment.

will be the prominent characteristics of what I write. And what is there to write about? Happiness has no succession of events, because it is part of eternity; and we have been living in eternity ever since we came to this old manse. Like Enoch, we seem to have been translated to the other state of being without having passed through death. Our spirits must have flitted away unconsciously in the deep and quiet rapture of some long embrace, and we can only perceive that we have cast off our mortal part by the more real and earnest life of our souls.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS.

Yale University.

THE DEMON OF THE ABSOLUTE. By Paul Elmer More. New Shelburne Essays, Vol. I. The Princeton University Press. 1928.

In this collection of essays the usual themes of Mr. More and his school are to be found; he has his way with the Middle Ages, Huxley, science in general, Kant, the Ph.D., and the scholar who prepares bibliographies of Chaucer when he ought to be reading Shelburne Essays; on the other hand, there is much of moralism and the greatness of Professor Babbitt. Nevertheless there is much acute observation and wide and various learning.

The first essay deals with what may be called the either-or theory of life, especially in relation to art. "Aiming ostensibly to simplify, [the new monism] really renders the nature of things incomprehensibly complex. Promising to release us from the known paradox of a world composed of two irreconcilable classes of things, it ends by forcing a perfectly arbitrary paradox upon us in its definition of inanimate objects." Other essays treat of Trollope, George Borrow, and Henry Vaughan; the essay on Vaughan is especially valuable, though perhaps rather too apologetic about the poet's artistic power. The last is a translation of the fascinating story of Savatri, the ideal wife, from the *Mahabharata*.

Two essays deal with American literature. The first, "Modern Currents in American Literature," is concerned with the "middle generation." In the "æsthetic school" are to be found Miss Lowell and Mr. Cabell. "When Mr. Cabell talks of literature he has something to say that at least arrests one's attention. . . . A reader prejudiced in favour of precision may complain of Mr. Cabell's failure to discriminate between ideas and ideals, that is between an intuition into the eternal truth of things behind the curtain of appearances and an attempt to wrap the hateful facts of reality in veils of deliberate illusion. But such a confusion is not peculiar to Mr. Cabell; it is in fact the very atmosphere of the pseudo-Platonism which for many minds today offers the only alternative to a sordid pessimism, and which has been endowed with professional standing and with more than professorial charm by Professor Santayana."

Of the "realistic school" are Sinclair Lewis, Theodore Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson, and John Dos Passos. Mr. More has read an astonishing

amount of the work of these men and has found them not altogether bad; at least he recognizes in them "talent and earnestness." On the whole, to be sure, they are well disposed of. John Dos Passos' "much-bruited novel *Manhattan Transfer*, with its unrelated scenes selected to portray the more sordid aspect of New York, and with its spattered filth, might be described in a phrase as an explosion in a cesspool." "For my own part I regard [Mr. Dreiser's] autobiography, despite or possibly because of its shameless 'exhibitionism,' as more significant than any of his novels, as perhaps, with Sherwood Anderson's similar *Story Teller's Story*, the most significant thing that has come out of our school of realism. . . . *The Book About Myself* has the telling straightforward style and method natural to a trained reporter, whereas the English of Mr. Dreiser, when, as sometimes in his novels, he tries to be literary, is of the mongrel sort to be expected from a miscegenation of the gutter and the psychological laboratory." "If he only had had a chance, he might possibly have produced that fabulous thing, the great American novel. As it is he has brought forth a *monstrum informe cui lumen ademptum*." The *Spoon River Anthology* "was in its way a notable achievement; but the unfailing dullness of Mr. Master's subsequent productions shows that the *Anthology* was at best only a malodorous flash in the pan." "I suspect that *Main Street* owed its vogue in part . . . to its flattery of those who like to believe that, whatever their sins, they are better folk than the dull hypocrites who grovel and boast in so typical community as Gopher Prairie. . . . Otherwise it is hard to account for the success of so monotonous a tale written in so drab and drizzling a style. One might feel there was something wholesome in this satirical treatment of the very sources of realism, were it only possible to discover anywhere in the pages of Mr. Lewis—or in those of Mr. Masters for that matter—an indication that the author himself had risen more than an inch above the æsthetic and ethical level of the people he insults."

In the next essay, "A Note on Poe's Method," Mr. More appears in the very camp of the "unsympathetic" and "antipathetic" "English departments of our colleges," for it was published in *Studies in Philology*, along with bibliographies. On Poe's account of the composition of "The Raven" he remarks: "I am inclined to believe that *The Raven* was actually composed very much as the author explains, and that his essay is not only essentially true to facts but throws a remarkable light on one phase of his genius." His chief objection to Poe's work is "that it leaves almost untouched the richest source of human feeling." On the whole Mr. More's estimate of Poe is rather too high to harmonize with his judgment: "Poe remains chiefly the poet of unripe boys and unsound men."

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

Duke University.

GLEANINGS IN EUROPE: FRANCE. By James Fenimore Cooper. Edited by Robert E. Spiller, Ph.D. New York: The Oxford University Press. 1928. xxxiv + 395 pages. $3.50.

Cooper's books on his travels are neither well known nor easily accessible today. Professor Spiller's announcement of his intention to reprint them is most welcome, and if the quality of the editing and the bookmaking in the first of the series, *Gleanings in Europe: France*, is maintained in the other volumes, the complete set will have great value.

In the introduction to this volume Professor Spiller writes a general account of the *Gleanings in Europe*. He gives at the same time an excellent summary of Cooper as a social critic and of the reception accorded his books of travel when they appeared. It may be that he extols too highly Cooper's comments on men and manners abroad and at home, but he gives not only his opinion but also the evidence upon which it is based, so that anyone who disagrees may still profit by the material he has collected and from it and from the excellent reprint of Cooper's work proceed to form his own judgment.

From the narrowly literary point of view Cooper's pages on France are not distinguished, but they contain much that is historically interesting, and reveal, now and then, points about Cooper himself which must contribute to any thorough appraisal of his aims and success as a novelist. Certainly to understand why he wrote as he did, to assess fairly his achievement—and to explain some of the worst lapses in his novels—one must appreciate how fundamental was his interest in social criticism. This interest seems to have been deeper than his concern for the artistic aspects of the novel or for purely literary values of any kind. To it every page of *Gleanings in Europe: France* bears witness.

Aside from this, the appeal of the book to students of literature lies principally in those scattered passages which display Cooper's attitude toward his own country, his aristocratic prejudices, and the standards by which he judged men and women. It is hard to read this book through without marveling at the scantiness of material showing any interest on Cooper's part either in *belles lettres* or in any central critical principle in matters of literary art. In one place, to be sure, he remarks (p. 249): "It has often happened to me, when, filled with wonder and respect for the daring and art of man, I have been wandering through the gorgeous halls of some palace, or other public edifice, that an orrery or a diagram of the planetary system has met my eye, and recalled me, in a moment, from the consideration of art, and its intrinsic feebleness, to that of the sublimity of nature." This has obvious implications, but there are few other paragraphs which shed any light on Cooper's artistic theories. Much of the book, indeed, seems commonplace—long descriptions of scenes and events neither very important nor strikingly well described. Yet, of course, the very sections which are tamest for one reader may well be those which,

to another with different preoccupations, hold most that is of use; and it is a matter for congratulation that Professor Spiller has chosen to reprint the complete text rather than to add one more to the long list of "abridged," "condensed," or "selected" versions of American books. They fully satisfy no one, and are usually incentives to unjust and incomplete critical dicta, so that they become downright obstacles to the study of American literature; Mr. Spiller's work, on the other hand, is a thoroughly well designed tool for that study and a sample of what might to advantage be done for scores of our other "forgotten books."

KENNETH B. MURDOCK.

Harvard University.

HENRY TIMROD, *Laureate of the Confederacy*. By Henry T. Thompson. Columbia, S. C.: The State Company. 1929.

Perhaps the fairest approach to this volume will be made after a wholehearted recognition of the purpose which the author avows to have dictated its preparation. In his preface Mr. Thompson states that he recalls vividly his own childhood recollection of Timrod and how the "remarkable personality and cumulative misfortunes" of the poet "profoundly appealed to the emotions and imagination" of his youth. With this early impression as a starting point, this book "thus represents a labor of love." And, further,

> The purpose of this little book is therefore to afford the people of South Carolina a better opportunity of becoming acquainted with Timrod's writings; and it is fondly hoped that it will serve to engrave upon the minds and enshrine in the hearts of men a memorial even more enduring than the beautiful tributes in bronze and marble which have been paid to the poet's memory by his loving friends.

This "labor of love" idea dominates the book and, for the student of American literature, sufficiently characterizes its qualities and enthusiasms. There is no serious effort here to re-examine or re-assess Timrod's significance as a writer. The critical purpose is absent. Too frequently Mr. Thompson is content simply to quote commendatory statements collected from various sources. Whole pages are given to this glorification of Timrod, and, one suspects, such adverse comments as may have presented themselves have been omitted. The level of critical intelligence addressed by the volume is most readily suggested by the character of the footnotes to the reprinted Timrod poems. Mr. Thompson finds it necessary to append explanations for such terms as "cot," "germs," "Dryad," and "brine."

Even while deprecating the lack of anything like a critical estimate of Timrod, the student of American literature will not find this book utterly barren. Here is a brief biographical sketch introducing some personal reminiscences and family tradition which add some few footnotes to our knowledge of the author of "The Cotton Boll." The biographical and bibliographical lists are useful. Here are photographs illustrating certain

places associated with the poet's memory. Here, too, are republished three little known prose essays from the pen of Timrod the journalist.

Even so, it cannot be truthfully said that this tribute to "The Laureate of the Confederacy" holds any very serious interest for the advanced student of American letters. A reading of the book, however, suggests two considerations which such a student might ponder: Is the time not ripe for a real study of Timrod as poet and man, and might the investigator not make a collection of Timrod's prose with a view, should it prove significant, to publication?

ADDISON HIBBARD.

The University of North Carolina.

SWALLOW BARN, OR A SOJOURN IN THE OLD DOMINION. By John Pendleton Kennedy. Edited with an Introduction by Jay B. Hubbell. American Authors Series. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1929.

We greet Kennedy's *Swallow Barn* upon its republication with the same pleasure that we feel in greeting a friend of our youth who has been absent from our midst for a long time and who suddenly reappears. *Swallow Barn* deserved a better fate than that of being consigned to oblivion for the many years which have elapsed since the last edition of it was published. The modern craze for antique collecting is recalling to our minds with redoubled force the beauty of old time furniture, which beauty shows more beautiful with the mellowness of age upon it. Such is the case with a book like *Swallow Barn*. Its genial author wrote it in one of his mellowest moods, and in it he pictures the sunny side of life in old Virginia "befo' de war." It is a book to be read for relaxation. In it Kennedy does not burden his readers with an intricate plot; so that it may be read with equal pleasure either in parts or in its entirety. I can think of no book which I should prefer to have for a traveling companion on a wearisome journey.

Professor Hubbell in a brief but appreciative introduction has pointed out that Kennedy was a man of considerable prominence in his day, and that he promoted the cause of American letters in more ways than one. In 1833 and the years immediately following, he aided the bankrupt and dejected Poe both financially and spiritually to such an extent that that erring genius later declared that Kennedy was the truest friend he ever had. It is my own opinion that Kennedy literally saved Poe from obscurity and possible self-destruction.

Kennedy's friendship for Thackeray resulted in much useful information to the English author for his great book on Virginia life. Upon this subject much has been said and much has been left unsaid. Some claimed that Kennedy actually wrote a part of *The Virginians* for Thackeray, and consequently a dispute arose which has not yet been definitely settled.

Professor Hubbell might have added that apart from Kennedy's aid to other writers, and his constructive efforts to improve the inadequate copyright law, and his part in founding the Peabody Library in Baltimore, he deserves for his own work's sake a greater recognition than has been accorded him. His *Swallow Barn*, as Professor Hubbell has stated, "was the first important fictional treatment of Virginia life; and its popularity helped to make Virginia a favorite background with later novelists." His *Horse Shoe Robinson* was declared by Theodore Stanton in 1908 (*Manual of American Literature*, p. 147) to be "generally considered the best novel written in the South before the Civil War." It was dramatized and Kennedy saw the play presented in Baltimore. As late as 1897 it was published by the University Publishing Company of New York in an edition designed for use in schools. *Rob of the Bowl*, Kennedy's last novel, pictures an interesting period in the history of Colonial Maryland which has barely been touched in American fiction.

We are greatly indebted to Harcourt, Brace and Company, and to Professor Stanley T. Williams, the general editor of their excellent American Authors Series, for including *Swallow Barn* in their list of titles. Like Professor Hubbell, many of us in the South rejoice to see a reawakening of interest in Southern fiction of the period of *Swallow Barn*.

Readers of AMERICAN LITERATURE will be glad to know that A. L. Burt & Company, New York, have recently republished in a popular edition both *Horse Shoe Robinson* and *Rob of the Bowl*. These books contain a number of full page illustrations by J. Watson Davis, and they are remarkably well bound and well printed for the price of seventy-five cents at which they are sold.

EDWARD M. GWATHMEY.

The College of William and Mary.

POEMS OF EDGAR ALLAN POE. Edited by Howard Mumford Jones. New York: The Spiral Press. 1929. vi + 55 pp. Limited edition. $10.00.

THE DAY OF DOOM, *or a Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment, with Other Poems*. Edited by Kenneth B. Murdock. With drawings adapted from early New England gravestones by Wanda Gág. New York: The Spiral Press. 1929. xi + 94 pp. Limited edition. $6.00.

With the publication of these two volumes, the Spiral Press has launched a notable series of beautifully printed books in the field of American literature, under the general editorship of Howard Mumford Jones. Approximately six titles are to be issued annually, each in a suitable format.

Printed in Lutetia type on Montval hand-made paper, Professor Jones's edition of Poe's poems is a very handsome book. The large page size makes it possible to avoid breaking the long lines of "The Raven" and

"The Bells." Professor Jones has tried to include "every poem which by some passage of memorable magic belongs in, or aspires to, the small canon of his mature work." Only "Tamerlane" and "Politian" are unrepresented. In an admirable brief introduction the editor has pointed out that even within Poe's narrow compass there is a relative range of theme and solidity of thought." While Poe's poems are not free from "sentimentalism, mawkishness, merely mechanical ingenuity, and a certain affectation," he says, nevertheless, when one considers the work of most of Poe's contemporaries, "the astonishing thing is not that Poe exhibits these defects, but that these defects are relatively minor in the small body of his work."

In his edition of that early American "best seller," *The Day of Doom*, Professor Murdock has followed the "Fifth Edition" printed in Boston in 1701, carefully following the original except in a few particulars which he carefully notes. A brief glossary of obsolete words and a note on the text supplement the introduction. *The Day of Doom* is an extraordinarily interesting historical document. "Denied the title of great poetry, shorn of its claim to peculiar infamy as a supreme example of theologic fire-breathing, it still does not deserve to be forgotten even now when it can move no one as it once moved the Puritan children who huddled beside the fire and became breathless with terror and awe as they spelled out its lines. For, after all, is there any document which sets forth more vividly what Calvinism meant for individuals, sects, nations, for years influenced in all the activities of life by its curious hold on the mind of man?" ". . . it is diverting occasionally to read *The Day of Doom* simply as a curiosity and no more—a work in which a Divine Being conducts, in ballad measure, a logical debate with damned souls, and the terrors of the Pit are dealt with in the homely terms familiar to Puritan laymen two centuries ago. And for him who is ironically minded Wigglesworth and his verses may furnish a parable, wholesome to remember when idle speculations are in the air on such topics as the reasons for America's failures and successes in art and the true meaning of the words 'American' and 'democratic' when applied to literature."

Jay B. Hubbell.

Duke University.

BRIEF MENTION

New York City Newspapers, 1820-1850: *A Bibliography*. By Louis H. Fox. (The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, Volume 21, Parts I and II. 1927.) The University of Chicago Press. 1928.

This most useful work, although published in December, is already out of print. It gives as complete a list as possible of the newspapers published with the limits named, with details of change of title, names of editors and publishers, and occasionally other notes of interest and, finally,

a very complete collation of the files (even single issues), preserved in the collections of the New York Historical Society, the New York Public Library, the American Antiquarian Society, and the Library of Congress. A few papers are located elsewhere, but complete collations were not attempted for other libraries. It is perhaps to be regretted that fuller details about the Wisconsin Historical Society, the New York State Library, and Yale collections (and perhaps a few others), were not added, at least for the more unusual papers; the New York State Library, for instance, has the originals of one or two papers of which the American Antiquarian Society's photostats alone are recorded in this list. But probably Mr. Fox plans a supplement, as he asks for additions and corrections, and readers of *American Literature* who know of collections of New York papers may help him by addressing him at the New York Public Library. As one turns the leaves of the work, one is struck by the great publishing activity of the early thirties and middle forties of the century particularly. And as one looks at the many titles known only from references, or from a few scattered numbers, one wonders how much valuable information has perished with what seemed and, for the most part, was so ephemeral. Yet a great deal survives "to tease us out of thought" and the author has gathered accurately a vast amount of information. Anyone who attempts minute historical, literary or biographical research in the time will find himself deeply in Mr. Fox's debt.

Thomas Ollive Mabbott.

Brown University.

The Heart of Burroughs's Journals. Edited by Clara Burrus. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company. 1928.

Like the corresponding volumes on Emerson and Thoreau, *The Heart of Burroughs's Journals* has been compiled by a capable editor, thoroughly acquainted with all of the material from which selections have been made. One finds in the volume the usual motley array of jottings common to any diary and a host of entries dealing with nature, religion, and literature, covering the period from 1854, when Burroughs was seventeen years old, to February, 1921, a few weeks before he died.

The naturalist's occasional disparagement of his own literary accomplishment, made in a peculiarly detached manner, might prove that he was possessed of no ordinary discernment, if his reaction to the World War did not supply a gloomy indication of "man's talent for being gulled." Despite the consummate amenity of his life at "Slabsides," Burroughs was a typical Hun-hater, an eager devourer of war propaganda.

To the student of American literature perhaps the chief interest to be found in the book lies in the numerous remarks about Whitman and Emerson, whom Burroughs regarded as "my spiritual father in the strictest sense." There is a notable criticism of Thoreau that also deserves mention.

Walden, after a second reading, appeared to be "a vast deal of chaff without any wheat."

One might be inclined to regard some of the bits of nature lore as unnecessary padding, but that is a wholly personal matter, no doubt.

CLARENCE GOHDES.

Columbia University.

THE SOUTHWEST IN LITERATURE. Edited by Mabel Major and Rebecca W. Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. xvi + 370 pp.

"The aim of *The Southwest in Literature* is to furnish teachers in the high schools of the Southwest with an anthology of good literature *about* the Southwest. Both the editors . . . have felt the need of fresh material which is related to the daily lives of boys and girls in this part of the country. However admirable 'The Rhodora' and 'Snowbound' are as literature, they mean little in the experience of our pupils in this section. . . . Instead of making a collection of the works of writers who live in this section, we have disregarded sectional lines as to authorship and have selected from writers everywhere those poems and prose works which depict the life of the Southwest." (Foreword to the Teacher.) This well edited textbook includes a literary map of the Southwest and a number of appropriate illustrations taken from pictures of Southwestern scenes by well-known painters.

J. B. H.

A SURVEY OF TEXAS LITERATURE. By Leonidas Warren Payne, Jr. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. 1928. 76 pp.

"An effort has been made in the following pages to sketch in outline form the history and development of the literature produced in and about Texas. It has been impossible in so brief a compass as I had at my command to include all or even a tithe of the many authors, books, pamphlets, and other writings prepared by Texans or about Texas, but it is hoped that the more significant items which should be of interest to younger readers have been at least briefly touched upon." (Author's Preface.)

J. B. H.

BEST SHORT STORIES FROM THE SOUTHWEST. Edited by Hilton Ross Greer. Dallas: The Southwest Press. 1928. iv + 386 pp.

"The typical short story of the Southwest," says Mr. Greer, "wears the colors of sun and sand and saddle-leather. This volume offers the reader a more varied exhibit." The Southwest is, quite naturally, somewhat weary of the conventional rôle which it has played in our fiction as the home of the cowboy and the Indian. Of the sixteen stories included in this volume only three or four deal with the traditional Southwest. The authors

represented in the collection are Mary Austin, Joseph Hall Ranson, Westmoreland Gray, Barry Benefield, Dorothy Scarborough, Winifred Sanford, John W. Thomason, Jr., Horace McCoy, A. W. Somerville, Chester T. Crowell, Norma Patterson, Thyra Samter Winslow, Margaret Belle Houston, Eugene Manlove Rhodes, Ted Dealey, and Olive McClintic Johnson.

J. B. H.

THE SPANISH ELEMENT IN SOUTHWESTERN FICTION. By [Miss] James Ellen Stiff. Privately printed. 1928. iii + 68 pp.

A master's thesis from Southern Methodist University.

J. B. H.

THE ANTHOLOGY OF ALABAMA POETRY, 1928. Compiled by the Alabama Writers' Conclave. With a Foreword by Frances R. Durham. Atlanta: Ernest Hartsock: The Bozart Press. 103 pp. $2.00.

Among the poets represented in this collection of contemporary Alabama verse are Clement Wood, Lawrence Lee, and John Trotwood Moore. "A Biographical Dictionary of Alabama Poets" is appended.

J. B. H.

MICHIGAN NOVELISTS. By Bernice M. Foster. Ann Arbor: George Wahr. 1928. 30 pp. $.40.

A list of Michigan writers of fiction, old and new, with titles and publication dates of novels. Among those included are Rex Beach, Edna Ferber, Ring Lardner, Stewart Edward White, Mary H. Catherwood, and Constance Fenimore Woolson.

J. B. H.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN ORATORY. By Warren Choate Shaw. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1928. iv + 669 pp.

A collection of American orations from Patrick Henry to Woodrow Wilson with introductions giving the biographical and historical setting for each oration. This is a good school text but not a history of American oratory in the narrow sense of the word.

J. B. H.

THE CONJURE WOMAN. By Charles W. Chesnutt. With a Foreword by J. E. Spingarn. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company. vii + 229 pp.

Of the author of *The Conjure Woman*, originally published in 1899, Mr. Spingarn says: "Mr. Chestnutt's novels . . . are the first novels in which an American of Negro descent has in any real sense portrayed the fortunes of his race. . . . *The Conjure Woman* is the earliest of his novels, and is quite different from its successors. It is folktale pure and simple, but folktale most delightfully and whimsically told. . . . He was the first Negro novelist, and he is still the best."

J. B. H.

XU